SLAVERY IN ANCIENT INDIA

DEV RAJ CHANANA

SLAVERY IN ANCIENT INDIA

AS DEPICTED IN PALI AND SANSKRIT TEXTS

WITH A FOREWORD BY

J. FILLIOZAT

OF THE COLLEGE DE FRANCE



PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE

AUGUST 1960

Printed and published by D. P. Sinha at New Age Printing Press, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi, for People's Publishing House Private Limited, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi.

"पत्रं पुष्पं फलं तोयं यो मे भक्त्या प्रयच्छति
तदहं भक्त्युपहृतं अश्नामि प्रयतात्मनः।"

To the memory of
PANDIT LILADHARA SHASTRI

FOREWORD

For a long time at first, Indologists had studied Indian society almost exclusively according to the theoretical Sanskrit texts, i.e., the *Dharmashastras*.

The society observed by the majority of the Indologists of late eighteenth century could not directly provide them with a clear and correct image of its specific Hindu component, of its foundation. At least in the regions that first came under British authority, like Bengal, this society had manifestly certain non-Hindu elements, which had dominated it in the name of the Mughal empire or following the same, foreign or Mussalman. The Hindu element, massive and distinct, was of course there, but it had a very complicated internal structure and presented a closed look to the external world. It was distinctly noticeable and its importance was evident, but it defied an analysis. However, it was conscious of its strength: it had its traditions, its literature, its savants and its classical system of teaching. One could examine its state, its nature, its origins, and the development which finally brought it to its then existing state. It was even necessary to carry out this study, for the twin purpose of knowing the country and governing it.

The language of the Muslim administration, which in Bengal made way to British rule, was Persian. This language had been established as the language of general communication all over the country, for, besides the literary prestige which recommended it, it possessed the practical advantage, in a country of diverse languages, of being the medium of communications. Nevertheless, Persian could only lead to a superficial knowledge of India and it was soon found out that Sanskrit, in which only the savants had been interested at first, was the key to a true comprehension of India. And so, the Asiatic Society of Calcutta and the British administration of Bengal soon began to devote their attention to Sanskrit, the same language which William Jones,

the founder of the Asiatic Society, had earlier thought fit to treat with disdain while disputing the usefulness of the studies of Anquetil-Duperron.

Thus it is that they had to take recourse, rightly and with success, to the Pandits of Calcutta. They named and explained their main books and as early as 1794 William Jones published the translation of *Manu* which was immediately welcomed in Europe as a revelation of Indian society and was re-translated into German in 1797. Colebrooke's *Digest of Hindu Law* appeared in 1801 and was based on several texts of Hindu Law in Sanskrit. Since then, in Europe, one turned above all to Manu for information regarding Indian society because the text was considered as going back to the origins of Indian society and also because it was still in force. It had regulated life in India from ancient antiquity to our times and therefore represented the true norm of Indian life. It was in *Manu* and in the literature related to it that the most authentic and specific facts of Indian civilisation and of living conditions in India were to be found.

The interest which it aroused was well justified and one cannot over emphasise the importance of the vast literature on *Dharma*, the good order. This literature has by its strong and continued tradition really dominated the life of the people in India and of countries under Indian influence. However, to dominate life is not the same thing as to describe it. The literature of the *Dharmashastras* describes a constantly pursued official ideal, not, however, by all, nor always, and it is necessary to determine in every case its relation to reality. And this reality can be directly observed in its present form and its ancient forms are revealed by allusions found in literature.

In this respect the ancient Buddhist texts, the Sanskrit epics and the fables constitute the main source of documentation. Having aims other than the description of society, these texts talk of it without motives, *en passant*, in such form as it is known to the authors and the public. When the period of editing is known, the references found therein have the value of historical evidence on the reality of their time. These texts can, because of their spontaneous nature and their relation to a particular

period, replace the theoretical teachings which cannot be definitely placed in space or time. These latter are not completely imaginary, for on the one had they are partly based on the existing state of things at the time when their principles were conceived, and on the other hand they have often been effectively imposed in practice. Possible motives of reform, however, deprive them of the nature of descriptive documents. Even when they are completely of this nature, their value is diminished because of the uncertainties regarding the exact period in which they were originally written and whose customs they noted. Finally, there is uncertainty concerning the extent and the localisation, in space as much as in time, of their application. Their use in the history of social phenomena and their conditions of development requires a verification by comparisons which can precisely be furnished by chance evidence from texts of other schools.

It is because of this that the stories describing people in daily life are so precious by the allusions they make to the forms and aspects of this life. Even stories about animals can be used because the fictitious animal society described therein is in the image of human society. However, such stories in the *Panchatantra*, *Hitopadesha* and elsewhere are as difficult to place in time as the *Dharmashastras*.

In respect of indications furnished, the two epics, *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* are superior. Even though the periods, of composition of *Ramayana*, a more unitary work, and of compilation of *Mahabharata* are still ill determined, their basic facts can be assigned to a relatively ancient age. This period is, however, later to the first flowering of the *Dharmashastra* literature, which is largely utilised in the *Mahabharata* and whose rather ancient existence is thereby guaranteed. Above all, in the course of their stories, the epics give more spontaneous indications than those which the *Mahabharata* takes from the *Dharmashastras*. Consequently, these indications are more significant to the living reality of their epoch. They are rich in facts which are either original or are corroborated and have therefore two different reasons of interest.

The facts found in the Buddhist canonical texts in Pali are also superior. Even if abstraction is made of traditional facts and even if it is not admitted that these were compiled entirely at the Council of Rajgriha, held immediately after the *Parinirvana* of the Buddha, where they were recited according to tradition, there are strong arguments at least in favour of the precocious formation of a basic portion of the canonical texts. First of all, the texts are already mentioned by Asoka in the middle of the third century B.C. A little later, the inscriptions and the sculpture at Bharhut already refer to traditional stories about the earlier existence of the Buddha, and to the Jatakas, which have abundant allusions to day-to-day life in ancient India. Moreover, the similarities, often close enough to become correspondent, between the numerous Pali canonical texts of the *Theravada* with those of other sects, not apparently derived from the former, guarantee the existence of a common source quite near the original.

Even the fact that over a period when Sanskrit was coming more and more into use as the language of general communication and the majority of Buddhist sects were writing more and more regularly in Sanskrit, the *Tipitaka* was preserved in Pali, in middle Indian, speaks in its favour as a text faithful to an ancient.

Mr. Dev Raj has therefore rightly thought fit to base his study of slavery mainly on the most reliable texts of the *Tipitaka*, *Vinaya* and *Sutta*, as well as the two epics. In addition, he has gone through the rich *Arthashastra*, the practical counterpart of the *Dharmashastra*, and because of that probably nearer to the realities of everyday life, even though it is a theoretical text like the *Dharmashastra*. It is true that its exact date is still a matter of discussion. Its attribution to Kautalya, as an author of the historical period and held to be one of the ministers of Chandragupta Maurya, has not saved it anymore than the *Dharmashastra* attributed to mythical authors. In view of the suspicion of later editing, the authenticity of the attribution of Kautalya is often rejected. In any case, it must be admitted that the Arthashastra refers to a period not far removed from that which would be assigned to it if the attribution to Kautalya was authentic, even

if it includes details that may have been added relatively later. One of the major arguments against the authenticity of this attribution has been the fact that the Chinese are mentioned in the text under the name *Cina*, the Sanskrit transcription of *T'sin* and that this name could only have been employed after the unification of the country by the king of T'sin, Che Hoang Ti, more that a century after Chandragupta. But this argument is not decisive considering that (as was pointed out to me by Mr. Louis Hambis) the kingdom of T'sin existed long before it annexed other kingdoms and was precisely the country with which India could most easily have maintained relations. Thus the word *Cina*, in the *Arthashastra*, has to be taken simply to mean, as has been interpreted by many, the people of T'sin, rather than 'Chinese', the extended sense given later to the world.

The evidence of Greek authors on Ancient India, which through correctly dated, is fragmentary and hence not always decisive, has also to be critically examined.

It now remains to go through the Jain canonical texts in *Ardhamagadhi*, following the method used here. Mr. Dev Raj intends to take up this job himself and we hope that he will be able to accomplish it so as to complete the documentation on a question where the general conception formed on the basis of facts other than those of India must now make way for the most direct Indian evidence that we can reach.

Pondicherry,
September 25, 1957. J. FILLIOZAT

PREFACE

This study of the institution of slavery in ancient India was undertaken some years ago and seeks to examine the vicissitudes through which it passed over a number of centuries. Taking a slave to be a person who is under the full power of his master, liable to be beaten, branded or killed at the sweet will of the latter, an attempt is made herein to see if the slave's lot had always remained the same or if it had undergone some changes in course of time. As and when a change is noticed, effort has been made to place it in its socio-economic set-up. The period covered is primarily from the sixth century B.C. to the beginning of the Christian era, but chapters have been added to examine its antecedents from Mohenjo-daro downwards. In the end, *Smrti*-evidence is also analysed with a view to gain some idea of what happened to this institution afterwards.

As regards the sources for this study, I hope no apology is needed for giving first preference to facts found in texts of Pali. They have been supplemented by those drawn from a number of texts in Sanskrit. I have, however, not relied only on literary texts and have endeavoured to study facts brought to light by archaeology, anthropology, etc. Although this study relates to the history of ancient India, I have had, at times, recourse to events of medieval and modern Indian history, wherever such a course seemed helpful.

This work was submitted as a thesis at the Sorbonne and was first published in French in December, 1957. It has already been reviewed by a number of scholars, to all of whom the author expresses his gratitude. A number of changes have been introduced in the course of its translation into English. Thus the first chapter of the French version entitled, 'Studies on the Problem of Slavery', has been excluded from this edition and the second and third chapters have been considerably abridged and combined to constitute the first chapter of this book. A section on the ideological aspect of this institution, some remarks on food,

an appendix on the *kammakaras* (servants) are among the new materials included in this version. There is also a detailed analysis of the evidence of the *Arthasastra.*

Since the publication of the French version, I have found it necessary to change my stand on the verses of Manu relating to the Sudra and the *Dasa*. This will be found in the last chapter. I have also added new material from a number of texts like the *Milinda-panho*, some of the *Grhyasutras* and *Upanisads*. The Bibliography has been made much more comprehensive and a general index has been added here. There is, an addition, some re-arrangement of matter here and there. I would have also liked to discuss certain additional data, but as opinion on them is still sharply divided, I have refrained from doing so. The find of human bones under a sacrificial pit at Kosambi and its relationship with the description of the *purusa-medha* (human sacrifice) ritual in the Vedic literature is a case in point.

For the successful completion of this thesis I owe a great deal to Professor Louis Renou of the Sorbonne who has devoted his entire life to the study of Indology. Professor J. Filliozat guided this work in it thesis stage and arranged its publication in French through the French Institute of Indology. Notwithstanding an extremely heavy schedule of engagements, his advice has always been available in generous measure. Professors Armand Minard, Paul Lévy, Louis Dumont, Walter Rüben and Charles Parain were kind enough to go through the first draft and gave the benefit of their valuable advice to the author. The responsibility for opinions expressed herein and for any errors that may be found are, however, solely mine. Professors D. D. Kosambi and Bermard J. Siegel, very kindly and readily, favoured me with the copies of their articles required by me. I have also to express my thanks to Professor S. Dasgupta of the Delhi University Library for having procured for me the thesis of late Franz Steiner from the Bodleian. The index has been prepared by Sri Shambhudatta Sharma.

D.R.C.

New Delhi,

July 25, 1960.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

The *Atthakatha* of any text of the *Tipitaka* is indicated by *-a* after the abbreviation of the text, e.g. *A-a* indicates the *Atthakatha* on the *Anguttaranikaya.* Abbreviations of names of journals will be found in the relevant section of the Bibliography.

A.	*Atthakatha*
a.	*Anguttara Nikaya*
A-a.	*Anguttara Nikaya Atthakatha*
A-A.	English translation of the above
AIU.	*Age of Imperial Unity*
Ap.	*Apadana*
Apas.	*Apastamba Dharmasutra*
Ap. Gs.	*Apastamba Grhyasutra*
AV.	*Atharvaveda*
Baudh.	*Baudhayana Dharmasutra*
Brhas.	*Brhaspati-smriti*
BV.	*Buddhavamso*
Bur.	English translation of *Dhammapada Atthakatha*
CHI.	*Cambridge History of India*
D.	*Digha Nikaya*
Dh.	*Dhammapada*
Dh-A.	English translation of the commentary on the above
Gaut.	*Gautama Dharmasutra*
Hor.	English translation of the *Vinaya Pitaka*
j. or J.	*Jataka-Atthavannana*
	Khuddakapatha
Mbht.	*Mahabharata*
M.	*Majjhima Nikaya*

M-A.	English translation of the above
Manu.	*Manu-Smriti*
Mlp.	*Milinda-Panho*
Nidd.	*Niddesa*
PED.	*Pali-English Dictionary*
Pv.	*Peta-Vatthu*
Ram.	*Ramayana*
RV.	*Rigveda*
S.	*Samyutta Nikaya*
SBE.	'Sacred Books of the East' Series
Sp.	*Samanta-Pasadika*
Sp-s.	*Samanta-Pasadika*, edition in Siamese script
SV.	*Sumangala-Vilasini*
Th. or Thg.	*Thera-Gatha*
Thi. or Thig.	*Theri-Gatha*
Vas.	*Vasistha-Dharmasutra*
Vin.	*Vinaya-Pitaka*
Vv.	*Vimana-Vatthu*
Yaj.	*Yajnavalkya-Smriti*

CHAPTER I

STUDIES ON SLAVERY IN INDIA

This work aims at examining the question of the origin and development of slavery in ancient India. It is based on a number of Pali and Sanskrit texts and tries to study the historical, social, economic and political aspects. Our definition of a slave would be: any human being who is under the absolute control of a master and is considered by the latter as his property.

Before coming to the problem itself, it would be useful to recount briefly what has already been said about slavery in India. Without any claim to be exhaustive, we shall try to understand the main characteristics and emphasise the major tendencies.

1. UP TO THE END OF THE 19TH CENTURY

The question of the abolition of slavery had already been clearly raised in the 18th century. It was no longer possible to avoid it. The controversy was lively in France and England; both the countries possessed colonies where slavery was of considerable importance to the economy.

This is why, besides the studies on slavery in ancient Greece and Rome, attempts were made to collect facts concerning slavery in other countries having old civilisations such as India. Among those who were first interested in India from this point of view was Montesquieu. He said: 'They easily give freedom to their slaves, marry them, and treat them as their children. . . .'[1] In this and other remarks, he relied on the accounts of travellers like Bernier. Almost at the same time Abbé Raynal described the misfortunes of the pariahs who, according to him, were agricultural slaves of South India and were also untouchables.[2] One can also find in his works certain remarks on domestic slaves of Hindu merchants.[3]

In the beginning of the 19th century the remarkable book

of Abbé Dubois, who had lived amongst the people of South India for a number of years, was published. At the very outset, the author makes it clear that his remarks are valid only for the country lying south of the river Krishna, but assures us of the authenticity of his statements. He talks of slavery in Malabar and says: The pariahs are born slaves and cannot leave their land which belongs to the landlord. Moreover the landlords can sell the pariahs at will.[4] It stands out clearly from his text that these slaves were pariahs although all the pariahs were not necessarily slaves. He also affirms that this institution is accepted as legitimate by Hindu law and is regarded as quite ancient.

During the same period the East India Company had deputed one of its officers on an exhaustive survey of all the regions under its control. This officer, Dr. Hamilton (Buchanan), spent several years travelling in the territory under the English and has left very interesting accounts of the Mysore-Canara-Coorg region and of the regions of Assam, Bengal, Bihar and parts of Eastern U.P.[5] In his book one can find exact and faithful descriptions regarding slaves employed in agriculture and domestic work. According to Buchanan, in all these regions slavery was well established, was accepted as legitimate and had a long history behind it. Since he was concerned only with the description of life in India in all its aspects, he does not give his personal opinion on slavery (although it is not difficult to guess).

This task of taking sides for or against slavery had been, however, assumed by other English officers. While people like Sir William Jones deplored the misery of children sold into slavery in the streets of Calcutta,[6] others were able to utilise it for their personal gain.[7] It is against these latter that some of the English officers had to struggle. Besides their evidence, letters and notes (collected in a big volume published by the English Parliament),[8] they have left us many books. Among others may be mentioned *Slavery and Slave Trade in British India*[9] and those of J. Peggs and W. Adam (viz. *East Indian Slavery* and *Law and Custom of Slavery in British India*[10] respectively). In spite of the attitude of people like Colebrooke (to whom we owe the first note, which forms part of the volume published by the English Parliament, summarising the position of the slave in Hindu law),[11] who went to the length of pleading

for this institution as practised in Bengal,[12] the authorities could not neglect the problem, for slaves running away from the territories under the control of Indian princes entered British territory and claimed their liberty.[13]

To sum up, this agitation for the abolition of slavery in India (which was only realised in 1843) has given us some valuable information. The documents prove clearly that slavery was widespread in almost all the regions of the country and everyone was of the opinion that it was in accord with Hindu law and has been in existence since ancient times. The existence of this institution among the Brahmins of Mithila, well known in the Middle Ages for their knowledge of sacred texts, is confirmed by the documents registering sales and purchases of slaves.[14]

Once abolished it was soon forgotten, to the extent that a note on slavery in the 19th century had to begin with the following remark:

> In truth the idea of slavery has become so unfamiliar in modern British India, that it may be well to say a few words....[15]

That is probably why no one has spoken about it for a number of years.

However, the existence of this institution in other countries, where it no longer conformed to the social and economic conditions, stirred up a continuous agitation against it, giving rise to many historical studies. Among these latter, the first place belongs to that of Wallon. In the second enlarged edition of his book,[16] the author devotes one entire section to the examination of slavery in India. He utilises first the facts mentioned by Greek and Roman authors like Diodoros and Strabo, and then summarises the position of Manu. Although the author treats 'Shudra' and 'slave' as one, he describes precisely the different types of slaves.

Wallon writes nothing about contemporary slavery, which had just been abolished, as he was only interested in slavery in ancient times. However, his work constitutes an important study in which the facts noted by foreign observers and those of Hindu law, represented by Manu, are brought together, creating the possibility of posing the problem in its historical setting.

At the end of the 19th century, Letourneau[17] studied the

question of slavery in ancient as well as contemporary India. His work is remarkable for he tried to bring together historical facts and anthropological data collected by means of the studies of various Indian tribes.

Unfortunately this work remained unknown to scholars interested in the question for a long time. Jolly, while writing an article on slavery in ancient India,[18] limits himself to a summary of the Hindu law.[19] Another author[20] was, however, to follow Letourneau. He tried to draw some general conclusions from a study of purely anthropological data which had already been partly utilised by the former. We may remark that Letourneau reflects more or less exactly the state of Indian studies of his time; his sources remain Brahmanic; Buddhist studies have just begun to take their place with Sanskrit studies which were, relatively speaking, in full development.

2. FROM THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Towards the end of the 19th century Indologists began to take an interest in the sociological problems of the country and it is to one of them that we owe the sociological study of the *Jatakas*. R. Fick's book, *The Social Organisation in N.-E. India*[21] rapidly gained pre-eminence and has become a classic. According to him, 'Every big landowner, every rich merchant employed workers on a daily wage in addition to the slaves he possessed.'[22] As to the condition of these slaves he says: 'Except in stray cases, their lot was miserable and they were often exposed to thrashing, imprisonment and bad food.'[23] As to the domestic slaves: 'The domestic slave fared better than the despised classes, being useful in the house.'[24] Fick makes a distinction between conditions in Eastern and Western India, and says about the latter: 'At every step we find Brahmins driving the plough in the *Jatakas* and not only such as had their lands cultivated by slaves or day-labourers but also small farmers who worked their fields themselves.'[25] The author is, therefore, talking of a country where there are big landowners as well as small peasants; only the former utilise their slaves and servants to till the land. He also notes the existence of domestic slavery.

However, a little later Mrs. Rhys Davids, on the basis of the entire *Tipitaka* instead of only the *Jatakas*, expressed a different opinion.[26] Rhys Davids stated these arguments in his book *Buddhist India*[27] and Mrs. Rhys Davids took up the subject again in a chapter of the *Cambridge History of India*[28] called 'Economic Conditions According to Early Buddhist Literature.'

This was in 1922. During all these years their views remained unchanged and we may, without in any way sacrificing objectivity, cite them together. In the *Buddhist India* we read:

> There were also slaves: individuals had been captured in predatory raids and reduced to slavery, or had been deprived of their freedom as a judicial punishment, or had submitted to slavery of their own accord. Children born to such slaves were also slaves; and the emancipation of slaves is often referred to. But we hear nothing of such later developments of slavery as rendered the Greek mines, the Roman latifundia or the plantations of Christian slave-owners, scenes of misery and oppression. For the most part the slaves were household servants, and not badly treated, and their number seems to have been insignificant.[29]

As the study of these aspects of life in ancient India was the responsibility of Mrs. Rhys Davids[30], let us also cite her:

> The slave or servant (*dasa*, *dasi*) was an adjunct in all households able to command domestic service; but slaves do not appear to have been kept, as a rule, in large numbers, either in the house, or as in the West, at mining or 'plantation' work. Their treatment differed of course according to the disposition and capacity of both master and slave. Thus we find in the *Jatakas*, the slave, petted, permitted to learn writing and handicrafts besides his ordinary duties as valet and footman, saying to himself that, at the slightest fault he might get 'beaten, imprisoned, branded, and fed on slave's fare.' But of actual ill-treatment there is scarcely any mention.... We do not meet any runaway slaves.[31]

Unlike Fick, who notes the use of slaves on the farms of big landowners, the Rhys Davids question even the existence of 'big landlords.'[32] Their opinion on the lot of the slaves is also different than that of Fick. Besides, they bring out the fact of the absence of labour similar to that in the mines of the West.

The studies which come after those of Fick and the Rhys Davids re-state these two themes, adding some details here and there. The majority of them are inclined to support the view of the Rhys Davids and talk only of domestic slavery. The humane and kind treatment of slaves in India is emphasised.[33]

Although these authors have had the advantage of consulting new sources like the *Tipitaka,* apart from certain aspects of the conditions of living of slaves, most of them do not add much to the conclusions of their predecessors. At least some among them seem to derive a personal satisfaction from the difference in the treatment of slaves in India and those of the western countries. Others, not content with this much used contrast, have thought it better to juxtapose *modern* and *ancient* slavery. P. V. Kane, for example, begins his study of the problem of slavery in *ancient* India as follows:

> Slavery has existed as a constant element in the social and economic life of all nations of antiquity such as Babylon, Egypt, Greece,... It was, however, left to such Christian nations of the West as England and the USA to carry on the institution of slavery in the most horrible manner possible never dreamt of by any nation of antiquity.[34]

Some have tried to deny even the existence of this institution. In one of R. K. Mookerji's books,[35] the word 'slave' is found only very rarely. He has been careful to translate such embarrassing words as '*dasa*' and '*dasi*' by 'servant'[36] and 'maidservant'[37] respectively. Besides, by emphasising a particular stage of slavery in the West, these authors neglect the other stages traversed by this institution, and suppose, without having studied its evolution, that slavery in India has always been of the domestic type. This is all the more important for, apart from the origin of slavery attributed to the subjection of the *dasas* by the Aryans, no other signs of its evolution are mentioned except certain changes in the legal position of the slaves in the different codes. These historians are inclined to believe that the legal enactments attributed to various editors of the Brahmanic law constitute the only element that could have changed the nature of slavery.[38] Historical conditions do not enter the picture, the contribution of ethnology is neglected (from this point of view there is a regression since Letourneau and Nieboer) and the influence of technical inventions, such as the use of iron, is not taken into consideration.

A large number of these studies have been undertaken with the respectable notion that slavery is bad and that it has always been so. The moment they find the existence of this institution

anywhere in the ancient Indian society, they are distressed like the numerous admirers of Plato who are 'puzzled and distressed' by the presence of slavery in his *Laws*. Instead of an objective examination of ancient slavery, most of them are concerned with showing that India was not afflicted with the plague of slavery and that even if she was, the disease was not as virulent as in other countries.[39] A modern sentiment is thus transposed without any modification into the ancient times vitiating all objective study; for, even if it is true that slavery is a disease in the modern view, it could have been considered a natural phenomenon at an epoch when it represented a necessary form of the socio-economic evolution in antiquity, Indian as well as Western. Otherwise, how is one to explain the acceptance of slaves by sages like Yajnavalkya and later on by scholars like Kumarila?[40]

Slavery, even though it caused much suffering, was necessary at a certain stage of social development and was considered as a legitimate institution. 'No one in the old world could have imagined that slavery would one day be considered illegal. It was the natural lot of war-prisoners.'[41] From this point of view there is not much difference between Plato and the sage Vishvamitra. The role of religion had been to tolerate slavery as long as the dominant groups in the society considered it necessary. Once this necessity was met, the same religion inspired many people to struggle against slavery.

Proof of this is furnished by the hundreds of Abolitionists' Leagues that were formed all over England in the 19th century, the majority of whose members were devout Christians. The King of Nepal who proclaimed the abolition of slavery in 1925 was no less a devoted person than his ancestors. He prescribed this change in the sacred laws precisely by arguing that free labour would yield a better output[42] and faced with the necessity, he showed no hesitation in breaking these laws 'sharper than flint.'[43]

To us this is the first reason justifying a new study of slavery in India. The different aspects of this question must be examined without any prejudice or bias and without 'attributing modern wisdom to our ancestors'. We are convinced that by going over the same field in this manner it will be possible to rectify many errors of appreciation. On the other hand it is

necessary to study slavery in its historical setting and to follow its evolution with reference to historical evolution as a whole. In this way we may be able to improve our knowledge of both. Let us add in this context that a foreign invasion or the migration of people can have important consequences for a society and hence also for slavery in this society. It is also important not to neglect the level of material organisation of a society that has known slavery, that has practised it or that has abolished it. In this domain the knowledge of animal husbandry, of agriculture or of the use of metals have also played a role. Without pretending to be exhaustive, we hope, nevertheless, to throw some light on these problems.

Such are the reasons, therefore, that have led us to undertake a study of slavery in ancient India. But as the history of slavery in India extends over at least fifteen centuries up to the beginning of the Christian era, we have limited ourselves to the last six centuries of this period. This period is marked by such important events as the first political unification of India under the Mauryas as also by the presence of such personalities as the Buddha, who have left an indelible impression. Finally, the dating of the literary sources associated with this period is more certain than those of the more ancient texts, so also their distribution in space. This literature is enormous; we were thus obliged to limit our choice once again and to consider only the Pali texts as our principal source. To maintain the balance, as otherwise it would be a picture exclusively from the Buddhist point of view, and to corroborate the facts drawn from Pali texts, we have added certain Sanskrit texts also.

3. THE SOURCES

We have taken the Pali canon, the *Tipitaka*, as our principal source. An exhaustive survey has been made of the first two *pitakas*; the third one, the *Abhidhamma*, has not been examined, as very few, if any, of the facts mentioned therein are of direct use to our study.[44] The commentaries have been consulted in order to gain a better understanding of the facts collected from these texts.

Although these commentaries are 'recent', it should not be

forgotten that they are based on earlier ones, now lost. They thus represent an old tradition and should be treated as such. That the tradition of written texts was quite old, (older than atleast the 1st century A.D., to which is ascribed the earlier portion of the *Milinda-panho*) is shown by the reference in that work to a monk, Tissa, who was a *lekhaacharijo*, master of writing and whose writings were extant up to that date.[15]

We have also studied this well-known non-canonical text, *Milinda-panho*. As only the first three books can be regarded as forming the original nucleus of the work, we have included references from these books in the body of the text. References from the rest of the work have been put in foot-notes, except where it was deemed necessary to do otherwise.

Besides these Pali texts, we have also examined certain Sanskrit works, which can, with some measure of certainty, be taken to belong to the same period and which, because of their variety, shed light on many aspects of the life in those times. The *Nirukta* of Yaska and the *Mahabhashya* of Patanjali are of a technical nature. Compared to the *Tipitaka*, the information provided by them is scanty and more of an indirect nature. But it is accurate and very important. On the other hand, the two epics, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, represent both the scholarly and popular traditions. Addressed to a vast public, whom they have helped to shape, they contain almost everything that is necessary to learn: they are encyclopaedic works. But precisely because of their very nature they have been subjected to such drastic rearrangements and interpolations that it is very difficult to place them in time and space. However, in view of the importance of the information provided by them, they are indispensable.

We have also utilised the famous *Artha-shastra* of Kautalya. In the long line of sacred Sanskrit texts, where everything is considered with respect to *dharma*, this is the only text which, while claiming *dharma* as the ultimate goal, has no illusions about society. Moreover, it seems that this work was intended for a very restricted audience, with the result that it discusses everything with extraordinary frankness. Among the *Dharma-sutras*, we have consulted those of Vasishta, Gautama, Apastamba and Baudhayana. As there is not enough information in them, we

have made use of the data so obtained, only in connection with that obtained from other sources. We have, however, thought fit to group all such references at one place (See Appendix I). Some materials from a number of *Grihya-sutras* and *Upanishads* have also been added.[46]

Although these works treat of entirely different questions, there is an underlying unity among them. What is more, there is the same unity between them and the *Tipitaka,* the collection of the Buddhist canonical texts which, exiled from the land of its birth, have survived for centuries across the seas and over the mountains. This unity is the unity of spirit. In spite of the difference in nomenclature, the Buddhist and Brahmanic societies accept the same order in the division of labour and for the distribution of its fruits. The most striking fact is that the principle of distribution is basically the same, the theory of Karma, evil actions being punished by birth in a disinherited, unhappy state; good ones, by birth in a fortunate one. There is thus a unity which transcends all philosophical differences. Consequently, these texts may be studied together if, of course, they belong to the same epoch. This brings us to the question of their date.

While examining the dates of these texts we have accepted those assigned by the majority of scholars. The earliest date can be the 8th-7th centuries B.C. to which some portions of certain *jataka*-stories may be said to refer. Among the most 'recent' should be the *Mahabhashya* of Patanjali, which is assigned to the 2nd-1st centuries B.C. The *Milinda-panho* must have been composed by the 1st century A.D. We may, however, be allowed to point out that although from the point of view of editing, the present texts of the two epics are assigned to the opening centuries of the Christian Era, the nucleus of their main story is much more ancient and is, in no case, believed to be later than 1000 B.C., the latest date assigned to the battle of Kurukshetra. It goes without saying that the date for the main story of *Ramayana* is still earlier.

We have also utilised the accounts of foreign travellers who are said to have visited India between the 4th century B.C. and the 1st-2nd centuries A.D. It has not been possible for us to concur with the view of the majority of scholars about what these travellers say

regarding slavery and our reasons for this disagreement are given at the end of Chapter VI, which deals with facts on slavery as given by Kautalya.

From the geographical point of view, the *Tipitaka* can be easily placed as the major portion of it relates to the journeys of the Buddha. Each account or *sutta* begins, in fact, by stating the place where it was uttered for the first time. And, on a reconstruction of the life of the Buddha in this manner, we find that he never left the basin of the river Ganga, known otherwise as the Madhyadesha.[47] He elaborated the greater part of his teachings while travelling in this region. The *Tipitaka* has, therefore, North India and specially its eastern part as its basis. We may note that two other texts, the *Mahabhashya* and the *Artha-shastra*, were also elaborated in this part of the country and that the main stories of the two epics too are located in two different regions of the Madhyadesha. We may, therefore, state that our study of slavery will be, in the first place, valid only for Northern India at the time of the Buddha.

The Nature of the Tipitaka

The distinguishing feature of the *Tipitaka* compared to Sanskrit literature lies in that it contains much information about everyday life. Instead of maintaining complete silence about contemporary society it gives numerous details about it. All social groups, including even the beggars, figure in it. This is in contrast to Sanskrit literature which speaks only of kings and gods. Works dealing with wordly life, like the *Mricchakatika*, are few. It is in this domain that the *Tipitaka*, as an encyclopaedia of ancient Indian society, shows its superiority. Basing ourselves on it we may gather information about all sorts of people, such as servants, slaves, prostitutes and even thieves.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the authors of the *Tipitaka* had certain limitations arising out of their own state of mind. If they sopke of the people, it is because they had to speak to the people. The Buddha himself, having decided to take his message of salvation to suffering humanity, travelled across the entire country during forty years. As soon as he had gathered a sufficient number of disciples he asked them to go

to the four corners of the world taking his message for the 'welfare of many people.' The words of the Master, compiled later in the form of the *Tipitaka*, were thus elaborated when addressed directly to all the sections of the population without exception. This is in sharp contrast to the philosophy of the *Upanishads* which, while having the same aim (viz. the salvation of humanity), is not meant for all the people; only very few could understand it. Moreover, the vast audience of the Buddhist monks could not always comprehend philosophic subtleties and it was precisely for these uneducated sections of the population that the medium of folk-tales was utilised. The content of these tales was simple; their teaching could not be lost on anyone. This explains why a large number of these tales are scattered throughout the *Tipitaka* and the commentaries.

However, all these tales had to be rearranged and edited to establish a unique thesis, to illustrate a single theme, the impermanence of the world and the absolute need to escape from this 'house on fire.' Every other question, being secondary, had to be avoided or even suppressed. There was a similar attitude towards practices considered to be contrary to human salvation. If, for example, no mention of trading in slaves, arms, or poison, etc. is found in the *Tipitaka* it is because the Buddha, considering these as harmful for his devotees, had forbidden them.[48] On the other hand, all practices considered useful are described in detail and even exaggerated. We may cite, for example, the praise of charity. The Buddhists regarded charity, or the giving of alms, as an effective method of seeking personal salvation. They encouraged their followers on this path and have spared no efforts to paint a glowing picture of its benefits. This can illustrate the so-called 'edifying' nature of the Pali literature.

While going through these texts we must bear this in mind, for the absence of anything in the text does not imply necessarily its absence from the life of that epoch. There is no mention in the text, as we have remarked earlier, of the arms trade. This does not imply the absence of such trade at that time. The wars and the battles that took place during this period attest to its existence. Similarly, exaggerated importance should not be attached to facts mentioned very often, since the importance

accorded to them in the literature is not always in proportion to their real importance.

We may also remark that this literature was orally transmitted over centuries and that this practice has left its mark on it. We may assume that the repetition of expressions or sentences (or even entire passages) to express identical situations is the result of this practice of learning the *Tipitaka* by heart. Identical description of identical situations must have been of help in this task. The origin of standardised conventional numbers, such as the number 500 for the bullock carts of the merchant, or the number 'forty crores' or 'sixty crores' for the wealth of a Setthi may also be due to this reason. These numbers could have been of use in these long tales, mostly in prose. The desire to impress upon the people the insignificance of worldly riches, to make them renounce these in favour of asceticism, has also played its role. It is in this context that we may understand the tendency in these texts to exaggerate and multiply endlessly the numbers. This creates a bizarre effect and does not permit of any rational meaning being attached to these numbers. No trust can be placed on them, except of course to have an idea of their relative magnitude.[49]

4. SLAVERY IN OTHER REGIONS

The facts drawn from the Jaina literature for the same period are given by J. C. Jain. He says:

> Slavery was quite common in those days ... was so common that not only kings and wealthy people but even others kept slaves in their families.[50]

The author enumerates the different types of slaves, talks of some slaves well known in the Jaina literature and goes on to discuss the question of pledged labour and nurses.

In those foreign societies where life was regulated by the *Vinaya*, the organisation of the institution of slavery was also sought to be organised in conformity with it. In Thailand, for example, on many points slavery was directly related to the enactments of the *Vinaya*. This is all the more remarkable because in India the *Vinaya* only claimed to regulate the life of the Buddhist monks.[51]

In Cambodia Buddhist as also Hindu temples possessed slaves.

The economy of a Khmer temple was dominated by slave labour. Slaves of the two sexes, including children, figure among the donations to the temples. The temple-domains were cultivated by these slaves and fixed quotas of produce had to be supplied on certain fixed occasions. The treatment towards slaves does not seem to have been always humane enough.[52]

Ceylon has preserved for us a great deal of information on the subject. In his book, *The History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Bhikkhu Rahula, talking of slavery in Ceylonese monasteries, says '... that slaves, both male and female, were employed in monasteries from early days and for their maintenance large sums of money were deposited.'[53] The war-prisoners captured by the kings of Ceylon also figured among these slaves.

In the North-West of India, documents dating from the 2nd century found in Chinese Turkestan provide interesting material on the country when it was under Buddhist influence. The social structure was not similar to that of India; the institution of slavery, however, confirms on many points the authority of the *Vinaya*. It seems established that the Buddhist monks possessed their own slaves and bought or exchanged them if needed.[54]

CHAPTER II

ANTECEDENTS

Before coming to the problem of slavery in India in the Buddhist epoch, it would, no doubt, be better to examine its antecedents, to recall, though rather briefly, the socio-economic situation, and to place slavery in this context. This would lead us to a better understanding of the conditions inherited by the Buddhist epoch and enable us to shed light on certain obscure points.

The facts concerning this early society can be divided roughly into two groups, each relating to a different period. The most ancient ones refer to the 'Indus civilisation' and are purely of an archæological nature. Because of a complete absence of literary facts (no convincing deciphering of the seals having yet been made) this civilisation is also called 'proto-historic'. On the other hand, the information available in the *Rigveda* and related literature (all together going under the name of 'Vedic literature') has not yet been supported by archæological evidence and consequently cannot be accurately placed either in time or in space. However, studies carried on for more than a century have elucidated many aspects of this second epoch of Northern Indian history and have made it easier to understand the essential basis of the Vedic society.

1. MOHENJO-DARO

According to the archæologists the Indus civilisation belongs to the period between 2500 and 1500 B.C.[1] The extent of its influence is revealed by the existence of ruins at Rupar in the Punjab, Dabarkot near Quetta, Sutkagen-dor near the Sea of Oman and Lothal in Kathiawar. Nearly eighty sites, both big and small, have been discovered so far. And there still remain, no doubt, a large number to be discovered. The most extensive, though incomplete, excavations have been carried out at Harappa and Mohenjo-daro, the two ancient towns lying at a dis-

tance of nearly 700 kilometres from each other. The discovery of other sites all around the ruins of these two towns leads one to believe that these towns formed the centres of the society of that time and depended for their supply on the surrounding countryside.

No article made of iron has been found in these excavations. On the other hand a considerable number of articles made of bronze, copper, silver and gold have been discovered. Even some stone implements have been found but the use of stone had ceased to be frequent. On the basis of all this one can say that the Indus civilisation belongs to the Bronze Age. The supply of food depended on the cultivation of cereals (wheat, barley) and on cattle breeding, with fishing providing a third source. Agriculture was easy because of an alluvial and highly fertile soil. It is also believed that the climatic conditions at that time were not so unfavourable as today. The discovery of articles of foreign origin, as also the presence of Indian articles in foreign lands, confirms the existence of highly developed trade. A terra cotta model of a bullock-cart and the plan of a boat have also been found. The supply of necessities to these two big towns presupposes the existence of well-organised trade.

Although these two towns were rebuilt many times, their plan, covering an area of 2.59 square kilometres,[2] has not changed even minutely over many centuries. Every new construction followed, in its main features, the earlier plan. And therefore the form of the streets and lanes remained unchanged. All this implies the existence of a governmental authority which could supervise the detailed execution of the plan. The citadel, surrounded by a thick brick wall and dominating the town, suggests the presence of a 'governor'. And the granaries, wherein was concentrated the wealth produced by the territories depending on the town, reveal the extent of the economic power of the 'governor'.[3]

The available texts not having been deciphered, we do not possess any document that would give some indication as to the relations between the populations of the 'dependant territories' and the towns. Nor is anything known about the social organisation of each of these rural and urban communities. However,

the similarity between the material remains of this civilisation and those of Mesopotamia suggests the existence of identical social organisations. According to Wheeler:

> Based economically on the produce of the traffic of great river-plains, the kingdoms or city-states of these regions (Egypt and the Middle East) had an essential affinity with the contemporary cities of the Indus system. It would be but natural to find that this similarity of supply and opportunity, combined with a roughly analogous equipment, produced, in India, a social organisation not altogether unlike those of the contemporary West.[4] .

In which case it may be supposed that slaves existed in the rural community. Their presence in the town is more certain. The existence, in the towns, of at least three social categories—the rulers (it is not known if the priests and the civil authorities were two distinct groups), the merchants[5] and the artisans[6]—is admitted. And these three groups imply the existence of a fourth one, that constituted by the servants. These servants could have been wage labourers and or slaves (war prisoners, debt slaves, etc.). Marshall admits their existence when he assigns the small rooms in the big houses of Mohenjo-daro to 'slaves or dependant people.'[7] Beside these domestic slaves and servants there were also, we believe, slaves and wage labourers employed by the central authority. Proof of this fact is furnished by the discovery in Mohenjo-daro of two rows of living quarters resembling a barrack. These are found not far from the remains of five rows of circular platforms where rice was husked with the help of the pestle and mortar. Nearby were found the granaries. These living quarters, surrounded by a wall, are divided into sections, each consisting of two rooms (or one room and a courtyard) with partially brick-laid floors. Because of their identity with the casern of Tel el-Amarna, Wheeler regards their occupants as having the servile or semi-servile status.[8]

To sum up, slave labour could have existed both in the country and the towns of the Indus civilisation. This impression is based on the similarity of the remains of this civilisation (or more exactly of the two towns) with that of the river-valley civilisations of the same epoch. However, contrary to these, the Indus civilisation has not furnished any written documents (the seals have remained undeciphered), and consequently this hypo-

thesis about the existence of slavery must be made with a certain amount of reserve.

Nothing is known about the manner in which the Indus civilisation came to be destroyed. Was it war, attack by a strong enemy or simply natural calamities like flood or epidemic? No one can be certain. However, the discovery of bones (and even skeletons) scattered about in the streets (one skeleton testifies to violent death) lends belief to the hypothesis of an enemy attack. Once this hypothesis is accepted we must look for the enemy guilty of this total destruction. The temptation to hold the Aryans, who are said to have entered India towards the fifteenth century B.C.[9], responsible for it has been irresistible. The Aryans must have, on their arrival, been forced to battle against the existing inhabitants in order to install themselves[10]. We are reminded of the exploits of Indra, the Aryan leader become god, who is called *puram-dara*, or the destroyer of towns. On our part, we may observe that if the *Rigveda* calls Indra the 'destroyer of towns', it presents his enemies as the *a-naasa* or the 'noseless'. But the bones and skeletons discovered in Mohenjo-daro do not show the predominance of any one racial group. On the other hand they reveal an anthropological mixture, the population being 'certainly mixed'; the skeletal remains and figurines undoubtedly belong to several physically distinct types.[11] However, in the absence of any other equally plausible theory, this last must be accepted as a working hypothesis.[12]

The destruction of this civilisation must have led to a change in the relations between the town and the countryside, as also in the social organisation of both the rural and the urban populations. The countryside was no longer forced to supply and feed the towns, and the slaves, if they existed, found themselves free. The destruction of the towns brought in its wake the disappearance of the rich 'bourgeoisie' leading to the emancipation of domestic slaves. The rulers disappeared with their 'citadels', leaving their 'slaves' free. It is impossible that the destruction of the towns was necessarily accompanied by the destruction of the entire population. It is possible that the slave element was able to escape, along with other sections of the population, and to settle elsewhere as peasants or artisans or as wage labourers. In

any case slavery, if it was practised till then, received a severe blow. However, the possibility of an agricultural surplus did not necessarily disappear. Nor was the conception of debt slavery, war slavery, etc., abolished. Consequently, we may suppose that slavery continued without any major change in ideology, although its material manifestation was on a reduced scale.[13]

2. THE RIGVEDA

The Aryans on their part had, judging from the facts found in the *Rigveda,* a social organisation at a different stage of civilisation. They raised cattle and carried on the cultivation of cereals. They also had a rudimentary system of trade based mainly on barter. The division of labour was just beginning to develop and manual labour was not yet looked down upon. In one of the hymns of the *Rigveda* (IX. 112) mention is made of different intellectual and manual professions, all grouped together, such as those of the artisans, priests, doctors, arrowsmiths, poets, etc. The taming of horses gave the Aryans a superiority over their enemies. Even though they might not have been able to take their chariots over the Hindukush,[14] the chariot-builders must have been able to make new ones on the spot. Before defeating the Dasas and the Dasyus, (names of the people inhabiting the regions to the North-west of India?), whom they reduced to slavery, the Aryans must have known debt-slavery,[15] slavery as a result of defeat in gambling,[16] and war-slavery,[17] in their own country.

Having arrived in India, they fought against their enemies, the Dasas and the Dasyus, well-protected by their 'iron-forts'.[18] They had nothing but contempt for these foes, the 'noseless', the 'flat-lipped', the 'phallus-worshippers' and 'of hostile speech'.[19] The acknowledged differences in the features of the Aryans and their vanquished enemies, and also in their cultures, made it easy for the first to accept as slaves a whole people considered as inferior.[20] Since then, the word *dasa* began to denote a slave and has continued to do so till our time. Conquest conferred upon the victors the right to take the women of the defeated people as concubines and sometimes as wives. In this way, the woman of the Dasa, the Dasi became the *dasi* or woman-slave

of the victor.[21] And right in the *Rigveda* itself, we have a mention of children born out of such unions. Thus the *rishi* of the hymn I. 116 is Kakshivaan, born to a woman-slave of the queen of Anga from her union with Dirghatamas. Later many more such cases are mentioned, such as that of Kavasha Ailusha, who is said to have been the son of a woman-slave. He is also the author of a Rigvedic hymn.[22]

We may recall that another group of Indo-Europeans, the Hittites, also practised slavery. 'A special section of the Hittite population consisted of the peoples transferred from different occupied countries. They were also used for service in the army.'[23] The Hittite code mentions these two sections of the population, the free and the slave; in fact, this code is based on this discrimination. Thus the murder of a free person had to be compensated for by the gift of four persons while only two persons were necessary in the case of the murder of a slave.[24]

We may, therefore, try to form a picture of what may have happened in this epoch. Only the villages have escaped destruction.[25] These are inhabited by the native population which is forced to pay tribute to the conquerors. The latter regard these inhabitants as the *dasas*, the slaves, of whom any service can be demanded. At first only certain groups of new-comers settle down on virgin territory. New communities of settlers thus spring up making their living from cattle-breeding, agriculture, etc. In these communities the slaves accompanying the conquerors had to be content with their original lot, while in the first case, they may have been able to improve it by claiming a superior position vis-a-vis the native slaves. The same would be true for the case where the conquerors annihilated the entire native population of a region to install themselves in its place. The land may have thus been occupied by the new-comers in different ways and there is no valid reason to exclude any one of these or to regard, (as is done by Macdonell and Keith), any two of them as mutually contradictory:

Did the Aryans in India occupy the land as a people, driving out or exterminating or enslaving the Dasas, or did they merely form a small aristocracy of superior military force....? The evidence of the *Rigveda* is really fatal to the latter alternative hypothesis.[26]

It is in this light that we propose to examine the Vedic hymns relating to the *dasa* and the *dasi*. In one verse, the Dasa is said to have been black in colour, *krishna-yonih;* elsewhere he is called *akarmaa, amantu, anya-vrata* and *amaanusha*. He is distinguished from the Arya and it is said this distinction has been caused by Indra.[27] These Dasas constitute a form of wealth, *dasa-pravarga* and wealth belonging to the Dasas is expropriated by the Aryans and if need be, the Dasa populace could be destroyed for the well-being of the Aryans.[28] In a hymn, a hundred *dasas* are demanded as a gift while in another a gift of fifty *dasis* is mentioned. In another, ten chariots carrying *vadhus,* (signifying not the brides, but the forcibly carried away *dasis*), are said to constitute a part of the *dakshinaa*. Elsewhere we are told that a *dasi* is given along with a bride to entertain the latter in her new home.[29] In later Vedic literature we find the story of a king who gave away 10,000 *dasis* as a gift to his priest,[30] and a statement listing cattle, horses, elephants, gold, female slaves, fields, houses, etc., as goods from which may be judged the grandeur of their owner.[31] We may also mention here the verse, wherein it is said that by means of wealth, a *dasa* can become an Aryan.[32]

3. THE MOUNTAIN AND THE PLAIN

We now come to another aspect of the problem concerning the relations existing between the population of the mountainous regions and that of the plains. In the mountains life is more difficult as conditions are less favourable for agriculture and the yield from land is very much less than that in the plains. Consequently, as compared to the plains, the standard of living in the mountains is much lower. The poverty of these regions puts the population in a position of inferiority to that of the plains. And this may explain the presence of people from the mountains as slaves and servants in the plains. In Sumer, for example, the most ancient terms to denote male and female slaves are signs composed of *nita-kur* and *munus-kur* meaning respectively 'male coming from a foreign land' and 'female coming from foreign land'. In both the expressions the word *kur* denotes the mountain or the country of mountains.[33] In this connection we may also refer to the *Paraskara Grihyasutra*[34] where we find the

details of a magic rite meant to discourage attempts at flight by the slaves and the servants coming from mountainous regions. According to Oldenberg,[35] 'It is possible that *utula*, as meaning a slave, who habitually runs away, is connected with the use of that word as the name of a tribe in the North-West of India.' It may also be noted that Macdonnell and Keith[36] mention (under the word *dasa*) that the Dasas inhabit the mountainous regions.[37]

This dependence of the hill people on those of the plains is also revealed by the sale or abduction of hill women who come down to the plains and become the concubines (or sometimes the wives) or simple domestic slaves of the rich. They may also be forced to make their living as courtesans or prostitutes. This practice has existed since very ancient times and is confirmed by the discovery at Mohenjo-daro of the statuette of a danseuse with 'big eyes, a flat nose nad curly hair.'[38] According to Pigott,[39] this woman 'certainly' belongs to the proto-australoid type and represents a 'Kulli' woman in the plains.[40]

We are now in a position to form a picture of what might have happened in India after the arrival of the Aryans. In areas where the Aryans set themselves up as victors there was a general enslavement of the native population. Elsewhere, in the regions from which the native population was expelled or which were uninhabited, the new-comers were accompanied only by their own slaves, if they had any. Moreover, the people of the mountainous regions always furnished, for the reasons enumerated above, slave labour to the ruling groups of the neighbouring plains.

Consequently, in this epoch, the word *dasa* denoted a human being placed under the absolute power of another and the institution of slavery was based on an ethnic distinction. Later on a complete mixing of the immigrant and the native population took place leading to the disappearance of the ethnic distinction. This is proved by the existence of respected personages like Rama and Krishna, and heroines like Draupadi, who had dark skins. In the same way we find the mention of Kanha (note the name, a Middle-Indian form of Krishna), son of a slave, who founded a family of Brahmins.[41] We may also mention that

Kaaludaayi, Udaayi, the Black, was the trusted counsellor of Suddhodana, the father of the Buddha.[42] Thus even before the beginning of the Buddhist epoch all distinctions of colour between the Arya and the *dasa* had completely disappeared. Nor do we come across any distinction as to the religious beliefs or the language that would enable us to distinguish the *dasas*. For example, the slave-mother of Vidura or Mantharaa, the slave of the Queen Kaikeyi speak the same language as their master or mistress. In the *Tipitaka* there is no example of a *dasa* who is distinguished by the colour of his skin, his religion or his language.

On the eve of the commencement of the Buddhist period (6th century B.C.) a human being finding himself, due to various causes, under the absolute power of another is called a *dasa*. However, because of the immense size of the country, certain closed groups, with marriage outside the group forbidden, have survived here and there. The existence of such groups in the form of aristocratic oligarchies is confirmed by later texts.[43] In these communities the word *dasa* has not only its legal sense but also a pseudo-ethnic significance since an entire people is here considered as slaves. However, the rulers have sometimes the slave women as concubines. The Sakiya Mahannaama had, for example, the slave Naagamundaa as a concubine.[44] This led to a mixing of ethnic characteristics. We have thus, on the one hand regions (oligarchies) where an entire section of the population is considered as slaves, and, on the other hand, areas (monarchies) where this criterion does not hold.

4. THE USE OF IRON

Before the advent of the Buddhist epoch, another important event took place, namely, the introduction of iron in the manufacture of arms and tools. The discovery of iron has, according to the pre-historians and archæologists, a great importance in human history. Implements and arms, made of iron are superior to those of bronze. Iron ore is available in much greater quantities than copper, more uniformly distributed over the world and is available at a lower cost. Bronze was mainly used in the manufacture of articles of luxury and arms. With the

coming into use of iron many kinds of tools like the plough-share, the axe, the knife, the hammer, the sickle, etc., began to be manufactured in large quantities. The iron axe led to the clearing of forests that had been till then regarded as impenetrable, the plough-share facilitated the breaking up of the hardest soil. Consequently, the practice of agriculture spread over a vast area. The surplus from the resultant massive increase in agricultural production supplied the needs of a growing population.[45]

In India the Indus civilisation represents the Bronze Age. Its destruction towards 1500 B.C. coincides approximately with the discovery of iron in the world. According to Childe the method of production of iron in large quantities was 'apparently' invented by the people inhabiting the mountains of Armenia, in the Kizwadana[46] region. The Mitannian Aryans, who ruled over these people, guarded the secret. So did the Hittites who succeeded the Mitannians.[47] Towards 1000 B.C. the process had become popular and iron was worked in many places all over the Middle East. 'How and when iron-working spread to India... is still uncertain.'[48] However, the use of iron in India, as elsewhere, became common only gradually and it seems that it is only towards the 8th-7th century B.C. that its use became really widespread. Archæological excavations in India, though rather insufficient, do not disprove this hypothesis; iron objects have only been found in layers later than 1000-900 B.C. Iron implements were found by Marshall in a 5th century B.C. layer at Taxila.[49] The layer at Rupar is of the 6th century B.C.[50] 'The use of iron was added to that of copper during the 6th century B.C.' at the Purana Quila in Delhi.[51] At Hastinapur (near Meerut) slag-iron has been found in the highest level of a layer extending from 1100 to 800 B.C.[52] We may cite in connection with the Hastinapur excavations, 'It is noteworthy that iron is conspicuous by its absence in period I and II, barring a couple of slag-lumps in the top layers of the latter period.'[53] To sum up, 'the country had stepped into the Iron Age by the 2nd half of the 1st millennium B.C.'[54]

It is possible that the use of iron was introduced in India by a group of Aryans arriving about 1000 B.C. In this context it may be remarked that the so-called 'Armenian' process was the monopoly of a group of Aryans. (In fact, one is tempted to attribute

the military superiority of the Aryans not only to the use of the horse for riding and pulling war chariots but also to the use of iron arms and implements.) However, once the process was discovered, or imported, its use was bound to spread all over the country, for 'probably in no country of the world is iron found more abundantly than in India and in none are the ores from which it is extracted of greater purity or more easily accessible. Once, therefore, that the use of iron has been discovered and its advantages over copper and its alloys proved, Indians could have had little difficulty in obtaining adequate supplies of the metal.'[55]

We have already seen the existence in the Indus civilisation of various professions, like pottery, spinning and weaving, metallurgy (non-ferrous), and of different implements, like the plough, the bellows, the axe, the wheeled cart, the boat, etc. But it was not possible to realise all the possibilities of these techniques and knowledge as non-ferrous metals, from which all these tools were made, were fragile and brittle. The use of iron enlarged the field of exploitation of nature and enabled the people of India, as elsewhere, to progress more than ever before in the task of mastering nature, thus strengthening the foundations of the material civilisation in the country. We have, in fact, now entered an epoch where, apart from certain auxiliary new inventions, it is mainly a question of realising all the technical possibilities of the discovery of iron. The country is now on the road to an apparently unlimited material expansion.

CHAPTER III

SLAVERY AS DEPICTED IN THE EPICS

We have already seen[1] that the main story of the *Ramayana* is more ancient than that of the *Mahabharata*, although in their present forms the reverse may be the case. Here we propose to examine the kernel of these two epics so as to place the institution of slavery in its proper setting. At first we analyse the story of the *Ramayana* from the point of view of the state and level of the social organisations of Ayodhya, Kishkindha and Lanka and then we pass on to a similar analysis of the *Mahabharata* society in relation to Hastinapura and Indraprastha.

1. RAMAYANA

In the *Ramayana* we follow Rama, the hero, in his travels. Ordered into exile, he quits Ayodhya, traverses the Vindhyas and goes as far as Lanka. On the way he encounters some ascetics, and certain other people living in the forest but as far as men organised in ordinary social groups are concerned, he comes across only three of them, namely the Dashas, the boatmen, the Vanaras, living in and around Kishkindha and the Rakshasas of Lanka. The first among these, the Dashas consists of boatmen who live on the banks of the Ganga and, in all probability, have for their food the products of fishing, fruit gathering and hunting. Rama stays only for a short time with these people and the poem does not give us many details about them.

On the other hand, his contacts with the people of Kishkindha and of Lanka have been closer and have lasted a longer period of time and the epic is full of details about these people. In effect, the description of these two social groups is as rich in details as that of the people who inhabited Ayodhya. We can, therefore, study these three social groups together.

Let us start with that of Ayodhya. From the point of view of the organisation of its productive resources this society ap-

pears to have as its principal source of production the domestication of cattle and agriculture. All around the town, there are villages where peasants live. When Rama quits his town, the citizens get ready to follow him and abandon 'gardens and fields';[2] outside the town, our hero passes beside 'villages with their well-fixed boundaries'[3] and hears 'the voices of... the villagers.'[4]

Having passed by the last village of his country, and traversed the Kosala country, he enters the region of forests and only occasionally comes across human beings. It is only on the river-bank that he meets the boatmen, mentioned above. His travels across the forests of the Vindhyas never show us a village or an ordinary social group living together, except of course the ascetics. His first meeting with such a social group takes place near Kishkindha, where he makes friends with a group of the Vanara people, expelled from the kingdom. The descriptions of this area, and of these people, are quite detailed. Here we are shown the forest, the mountain peaks, a big lake and the 'town' of Kishkindha. In the midst of all the profusion of detail, one cannot help remarking the complete absence of agriculture in this area. There are neither villages nor peasants, nor a field to be seen. This leads the reader to conclude that during this period, the Vanara people lived by gathering fruits, etc., and probably also by the chase. Despite the enthusiasm of the poet, shown in the description of this 'town', wherein Kishkindha is presented to us as a rich and prosperous settlement one can observe certain signs which confirm this hypothesis: when Lakshmana enters it to remind Sugriva of his promises, he passes by 'gardens full of flowers'.[5] The Vanaras, assembled for being sent to search for Sita, bring with them roots, tubers and fruits which once eaten, satisfy the appetite for a month.[6] In fact, the poet calls the Vanaras, 'the fruit-eaters'. In addition to fruits, they drink wine; everybody, including women, was used to it.[8] One can also observe that when Rama selects a cave outside the 'town' for his sojourn, he has to subsist only on fruits and 'lotus-stalks' and fresh water.[9]

Later when Rama traverses the sea and arrives at the island of Lanka, he has before him only a forest, behind which is hidden the 'town' situated at the top of a small hill; the area

between the sea-shore and the 'town' is thus entirely covered with forests. There is no mention of villages outside Lanka. The complete absence of any agricultural activity, of a field, of a peasant is in marked contrast with the richness of detail concerning the general description of this 'wonderful town'. A detailed analysis of all the edible *alimentary* products of Lanka brings out the preponderance of meat, fruits and wine in the diet of the Rakshasas. In this 'town' grow trees which give mature fruits all the year round.[10] In the houses, meat of all kinds can be had: that of deer, of buffalo, of swine,[11] of peacock, of cocks, etc.[11] The women guarding Sita eat meat and drink wine.[12] In the food brought for Kumbhakarna, meat-dishes preponderate. The dish of grain mentioned therein is of 'divine origin'.[13] One can also note that only twice is fried rice, *laajaah*, mentioned; once on the occasion of the funeral rites of Ravana, where it is used along with *tila* for his *tarpana*.[14] Once again on the occasion of the consecration of Vibhishana as king is there a mention of fried rice and rice.[15] This is most probably the influence of the civilisation of Ayodhya because, in that town, these cereals are used for similar ceremonies. We can, therefore, see that the preference of the people of Lanka for meat is not due to chance, but shows that these people lived by the chase and by fruit gathering. In fact, one can say that the poet had no idea of any agricultural activity in these regions as the boon granted by Mahendra to Rama consisted in assuring a permanent provision of mature flowers, tubers, fruits and a perennial supply of pure water in all the regions inhabited by the Vanaras.[16] The absence of all culture right up to the neighbourhood of Ayodhya is shown by the boon granted by Bhardvaaja to Rama, assuring that trees will bear fruits all the year round.[17]

In these two cases, Lanka and Kishkindha, we can say that the people living therein had not, at that time, arrived at the stage of the domestication of cattle and of agriculure and, as a consequence, did not enjoy a complete mastery over a regular production of their foodstuffs. They lived chiefly by the chase and by fruit gathering. These means of obtaining food are rather precarious and do not allow either the constitution of reserves or the supply of food for an unlimited number of people. A group of people who live depending on these means cannot

afford to accept strangers and are obliged to kill persons captured in raids as also individuals who lose their way and fall into the hands of such a group. On the other hand, the absence of accumulated riches makes for a type of equality in the group and does not allow the birth of institutions based on inequality, such as debt-slavery.[18]

It is therefore normal that we do not find the institution of slavery either at Kishkindha or at Lanka. In contrast with the palaces of Ayodhya, those of Lanka although richer and more splendorous, do not have slaves. At Ayodhya, in the palace of Kaikeyi or in that of Rama there is always a group of slaves, both men and women.[19] But at Lanka, even in the palace of Ravana, the supreme chief of his people, there are neither men nor women 'slaves'. One can equally observe that the word *dasa* or *dasi* is found very rarely in the passages relating to the Rakshasas and the Vanaras and that also in the speech of educated people like Ravana and Vibhishana.[20]

In contrast with the societies of Lanka and Kishkindha, the society of Ayodhya has for its material base the domestication of cattle and the culture of cereals. From a study of all the relevant passages, it seems that these two are practised here intensively. In comparison with fruit gathering and the chase, agriculture assures a regular supply and by extending the area under cultivation, man can augment his total production and start a storage of surplus grains. This storage becomes possible because, in contrast with meat and fruits, the cereals can be preserved for a much longer time. This gives the possibility of nourishing a growing population and a society living by such means of production can accept strangers, at least as slaves. On the other hand this very storage gives birth to inequality in the community with the possibility of debt-slavery and of slavery for nourishment, etc. Now we read in the *Ramayana* that the town of Ayodhya was 'full of rice'[21] and that a part of the treasure of the king Dasharatha was in grains.[22] As a consequence, the existence of slavery in Ayodhya can be explained. (We should, however, note that it is not possible to accept at their face value the poetic descriptions regarding the number of slaves.)

Thus the societies of Lanka and Kishkindha do not know

slavery, a reason for the same can be found in the fact that they do not have resources permitting the birth of a similar institution. The people of Ayodha, on the other hand, live by agriculture and the domestication of cattle and have, therefore, the possibility of making a good use of slavery.

2. MAHABHARATA

The society of the *Mahabharata*, that is to say, the one to which belonged the Kauravas and the Pandavas, has for its base the domestication of cattle and agriculture. From this point of view, it has the same characteristics as that of Ayodhya. We may say that the man of the *Mahabharata* continues to make use of the technique acquired by his predecessor, the man of the *Ramayana*. As we have already noticed, as opposed to fruit-gathering and chase, agriculture and the domestication of animals make possible a regular increase in production and can, therefore, assure the satisfaction of the requirements of a growing population. Comparing the total cultivated area (in the form of villages around towns) of the *Ramayana* with that of the *Mahabharata*, we find that in the Madhyadesha, Ayodhya and Mithila are no longer the only two centres. There are, at this later stage, a large number of small and big towns, surrounded by villages; a large number of princely families ruling over communities living by agriculture and the domestication of animals.

In comparison with the situation in the *Ramayana*, the Gangetic valley is more densely populated. In place of the two princely families of Ayodhya and Mithila, there are many more to participate in the *Mahabharata* drama. Moreover, these princes have relationships extending as far as Gandhara in the north-west, and Anga in the east. This has been rendered possible by the extension of the area under cultivation. In fact, *en passant*, the poet, Vyasa, gives us an idea of the method employed for the extension of the area under cultivation, when he describes the deliberate setting on fire of the Khaandava forest. We may suppose that the princes used to open up new areas to cultivation in this way and to colonise them. If this hypothesis be correct, we may also conclude that the agricultural operations,

we had already observed in the process in work in the society of Ayodhya, had continued and had been extended.

This must have increased the capacity of the community to maintain a growing population as also the social inequalities. As a consequence, slavery here is very well established. We may also note that, on the one hand, this society recruits its slaves from within its own ranks, such as the mother of Vidura and, on the other hand, it accepts as slaves, persons belonging to forest-dwelling communities like the Asuras or the mountain-dwelling communities like the Kiraatas. From the available evidence it is clear that these mountain- or forest-dwelling communities do not live by agriculture nor by the domestication of cattle and have not been absorbed in the Brahmanical society. According to the archæological finds (*supra*, Chapter II), the use of iron has developed in India only after about 1000 B.C. From this point of view the two Epic societies can be placed in the Bronze Age. Now we are told that the agricultural implements of this period do not allow for more than meagre productivity which hinders the production of a big surplus. In the economy of such a society slavery cannot play a decisive role.[23] We may, therefore, conclude that the mention of thousands of slaves is due to later-day editing.

3. SLAVERY AS DEPICTED IN OLD STORIES

These stories, such as that of Vinataa and Kadru or that of Nala and Damayanti, can be divided into two parts—mythological and historical. In the *Ramayana* only one story retains our attention, namely the story of Shunahshepa, a boy who was to be sold ('bartered' will be more precise) for being sacrificed. This is accepted by the poet as a historical incident. If we accept its chief character Vishvamitra to be identical with a character of the same name in the Rama story, then it could not have been based on a very old incident. Probably in this epic this is the only example of the sale of an individual.[24]

In the *Mahabharata*, the enslavement, as a result of a bet, of Vinataa by Kadru and the giving away as slave of Sharmishthaa by her father are the stories which were taken to by mythological in the period of the *Mahabharata*. On the other hand,

the loss of the freedom of Pushkara as the result of a bet in the final part of the story of Nala and Damayanti and his manumission,[25] the presence of a retinue of one hundred women-slaves in the service of Lopaamudraa,[26] the would-be wife of Agastya,[27] the re-purchase by a king of the sage Chyavana[28], who had been caught in a net of fishermen and was, therefore, considered as their property, as also the gift of slaves by Bharata[29] may be accepted as historical.

4. DATA IN THE EPICS[30]

The epics have many incidents in which slaves, both men and women, figure; yet they do not give us any data like the definition of the word *dasa* or the classification of the *dasas*. One can, however, observe here and there, certain facts which can allow us to characterise, if not to define, the *dasa*. There are also other facts which can be put into certain categories.

i) *Characteristics of Dasa*

An examination of all the descriptions of the *dasas* brings out the complete absence of the ethnical distinction of the *Rigveda*. In fact, this distinction has completely disappeared and we meet, on the contrary, persons such as Rama and Krishna, who, despite their black or coloured skin have been promoted to the divine rank. On the other hand the juridical sense of the word remains unchanged and a *dasa* denotes a human being under the complete power of a master. Here are some details.

According to a verse of the *Shantiparva*,[31] many human beings make use of other human beings as their *dasas* and make the latter work by threatening them with death or fetters or imprisonment. The necessity for complete obedience to his master on the part of a slave, even when under the menace of death, is reflected in a verse attributed to Bhishma. He says to Krishna who wanted to kill him, 'Attack me as you like: I am your slave'.[32] According to Sanjaya, the Pandavas, after having lost their personal freedom in a gambling party, had become slaves and had, thus, lost all desires.[33] Elsewhere we are told that three persons, namely, the son, the wife and the slave have no right to property. All that they possess belongs to one who

owns them, i.e., the father, the husband and the master.[34] Explaining this very thought still further, one is led to the conclusion that the wife of a slave also belongs to the master of the slave.[35] The remarks of Draupadi[36] give us more information regarding the position of the children of slaves: they were also considered slaves. This conception of slavery is in accord with that of the *Tipitaka*.[37]

For describing the state of slavery, use is made of the words *dasa-bhava*, *dasya*[38] and *dasatva*.[39] These words have a general meaning embracing all types of slavery. On the other hand the word *dasi-bhava*[40] signifies not only the slavery of women[41] but also, at least in this particular context, all that one could do with a woman-slave. Here it concerns Draupadi, whom Yudhishthira had just lost on a bet. Although in menses, she was forcibly dragged to the court, where she raised a protest in view of her status of a free and married woman. But the winners said: You are no longer related to your husbands as they have lost you. Henceforth you are only a *dasi* and we can make use of you as we like. It does not matter whether you are badly dressed or not dressed at all.[42] This absence of protection for the woman-slave is similar to the state of affairs in the *Tipitaka*. But here, unlike in the *Tipitaka*, there are no references disapproving of such a treatment.

From the social viewpoint, the slave is a person who is looked down upon everywhere, at any rate for the very fact of his status. There is nothing worse than being reduced to slavery. It is by evoking her future lot as a slave that Mantharaa is able to win over Kaikeyi to her point of view.[43] In the other epic, the treatment meted out to Draupadi, after she had been lost, is one of the reasons for the big conflict. The Pandavas never forget this insult and are always seeking to avenge it. As regards Draupadi a feeling of shame and anger haunts her all the time. Her desire for vengeance, for never forgiving the criminals is so vehement that even Krishna is carried by this desire; yielding before her, he promises her to do his best. We know that this insult was wiped out only in a blood-bath. But as far as free persons were concerned, they thought it natural to treat their slaves as they liked. In the same context it becomes clear that the princes, who removed the clothes of Draupadi in the

court, were convinced of the correctness of their act as she had been lost by her husband, Yudhishthira, and that she had become their slave. She, for her part, would have been put in a difficult position, if it had been proved to her satisfaction that she had become a slave. Legally then, she would have been compelled to carry out their orders. That is to say, for the slave, the society of that age had prescribed neither any protection nor any consideration.

For signifying a free person or a person who had become free as a result of manumission, use is made of the word *a-dasa*[44] or *a-bhujishya*[45] (*a-bhujishyaa* in the feminine gender). It is to be noted that the word *bhujishya* meaning 'man-slave', has exactly the opposite sense in Pali.[46] It can also be seen that in contrast with the *Tipitaka*, the epics do not mention any ceremony leading to manumission. The master only tells his slave: You are no longer slave.[47] Furthermore a *dasa* can belong to any *varna* and he need not necessarily be only a Shudra. Similarly all Shudras are not necessarily *dasas*. Moreover, the *arya* of the *Mahabharata* includes the four *varnas*, and is differentiated from the *mleccha*, as is done by Kautalya.[48] (As in the *Arthashastra*, the Shudras of the *Mahabharata* are not untouchables).

ii) *Categories of Dasas*

Born in the family. Vidura, one of the finest characters of the *Mahabharata*, was born of a slave-mother and was regarded as a slave. If the Pandavas had not regained their liberty, their sons would have been considered slaves because of the slave-status of their fathers.[49] Here we can establish a rapprochement between the words *dasa-putra* (used in the *Mahabharata*) and *dasi-putta* and *dasera*.[50]

Purchased slave. In the epics the oldest example of the sale ('barter' would be more appropriate) of a person into slavery (for offering him to the goods) is described in the story where Shunahashepa is the hero.[51] The *Mahabharata* tells us of the anguish of a poor Brahmin who, unable to buy a substitute, is obliged to think of selecting one of his family for being offered to a cannibal.[52]

Slave of war. Having failed in his attempt to abduct Draupadi, Jayadratha is caught by Bhimasena and is forced, under

the threat of death, to declare himself to be the slave of the Pandavas. His hair is cut into five parts as that was said to be the procedure for persons enslaved in battle.[53] Here we can also take into account the verse which recommends the non-killing of a person who, putting a blade of grass in his mouth, declares: I am yours.[54] We may anticipate a little and notice here the incident in the attack of Vidudabha on the Sakiyas, the Buddha's tribe, where only those persons were spared who had offered themselves for surrender by putting a blade of grass in their mouths.

Gambling bets. Examples of loss of freedom are not difficult to find. There is the story of the co-wives Kadru and Vinataa.[55] The famous story of the loss of freedom of Yudhishthira, his brothers and their wife, Draupadi also comes in here, the bet for slavery being called *dasapana*.[56]

Gift of slaves. Here we can include not only the donations made to the Brahmins by princes such as Rama, [57] Bharata[58] or Karna[59] but also cases where slaves are offered as a gift, as is the case with Ravana[60], Krishna[61] and Kiratas.[62] The presence of the slaves in the dowry of the princesses can also be discussed here. Examples are furnished by the dowry of Sita[63] and that of Draupadi.[64] This classification of slaves is less evolved than that of the *Tipitaka*: for example it does not contain such types as the one resulting from judicial condemnation (See Ch. V).

iii) *Miscellaneous Terms*

Along with the categories discussed above, we propose to take note of certain terms which evoke either the origin of the slave or some other particularity of such a person. Sometimes they point out his relationship with his master.

Bandhaki (*Mbht.*, II-61-1; 35; V-35; V-38-42). After Yudhishthira had lost Draupadi, Bhimasena, like others, felt hurt and humiliated. Unable to contain his feelings, he told his elder brother: Even the inveterate gamblers take pity on the *bandhaki* women they have in their houses and do not put bets on them. This means that a *bandhaki* could be used as a bet. According to Karna, a *bandhaki* is under the control of several persons and she can be treated as her masters may like. We do not have much information regarding her legal status but

the facts mentioned above make us think that her status was that of a slave-woman. Elsewhere she is described in extremely bad terms. The poet places her on the same level as the travelling actors and musicians and says: Those, whose praise is sung by the *bandhaki* women, do not live long. According to a verse in the *Mahabharata*,[65] a woman who gives birth to a fourth child, as a result of her union with a man other than her husband, is known as *bandhaki*. It is interesting to note that the term has an equally bad sense in the *Tipitaka*.[66]

Anticipating a little, we may also quote Kautalya (V. 2). who prescribes a tax of 10 per cent on the earnings of persons living on the income of *bandhakis* (they are called *bandhaki-poshakas*). He further enjoins the use of such persons for channelling money to the king's treasury, by exploiting extremely pretty women in the service of the king. (T. Ganapati Shastri says: 'a *bandhaki* is a woman of high family, living like a prostitute.')

Dasa-bharya (*Ram.*, III, 3-18, *Mbht.*, VIII, 5-79). This term is correctly used in the *Ramayana* when Lakshmana rejecting the offer of marriage of Shurpanakhaa, tells her: But why do you wish to become the wife of a slave since I am but a slave of my brother. Most probably this phrase implied the reduction into slavery of a free-woman, if she got married to a slave. On the other hand, the use of this term by Dhritarashtra when he remembers the slave status of Draupadi, is not easy to justify,[67] because the loss of Draupadi on a gambling-bet had, legally speaking, dissolved her links of marriage with her husbands. She was considered by the victors as their slave and not as the wife of slaves. This impression is confirmed by the passage in question where all the speakers, including the victim herself, use only the word *dasi*, woman-slave and not *dasa-bharya*. The term *dasi ca bharya* may also be examined here. The term *dasa-bharya* confirms the status of a slave given to a free woman when she marries a slave, whereas the other emphasises the sweet nature of a spouse, a free woman who waits upon her husband, also a free man, like a *dasi*. This very term can be found in the *Ramayana* where Dasharatha praises his wife Kaushalya as follows: 'She serves me like a friend, like a slave. . . .'[68] In fact the poet expresses here the same thought

which is attributed to the Buddha in the *Tipitaka*. However, whereas the Buddha enumerates seven or ten types of spouses, Dasharatha enumerates only five types, viz. wife behaving like a slave, like a friend, like a wife, like a sister, like a mother.

Jnati-dasi (*Ram.*, II, 1-6). In this compound the word *jnati* is not explained but we come across a phrase which helps us a little. Describing Mantharaa, the poet says, 'the *jnati-dasi* of Kaikeyi, who had come with her (as part of the latter's dowry) and who was her maidservant.' It shows that Mantharaa was one of the women-slaves given to Kaikeyi as part of her dowry. If this is a characteristic common to all the slaves of this type, then one can say that probably the *nati-dasi* of the *Tipitaka*[69] was also a woman-slave given in dowry who accompanied the daughter of her master to her husband's house. If we believe the account given in the commentary on the *Itivuttaka*,[70] then the famous nun Khujuttaraa had also been a *jnati-dasi*, as she had been born in the house of the Setthi Ghosita of a wet-nurse (presumably with the Setthi as her father) and had been given as a maid when that Setthi gave his adopted daughter Saamaavati in marriage, to the king Udena.

Let us note, *en passant*, that the poet calls Mantharaa, a *kubjaa*, hunchbacked, and tells us that Kaikeyi had other women-slaves who were also hunchbacked.[71] Elsewhere we are told of the *kubjakas*, the hunchbacked men serving in the palace of Rama and it seems that they were also slaves.[72]

Dasa-karmakara-bhritya (*Mbht.*, V, 132-17). Leaving aside such terms as *dasi-dasa*, let us discuss the term *dasa-karmakara-bhritya*. The meaning of the first and the second of these three words is easy to understand, it being 'slaves and servants'. The third member of this compound has two meanings, the literal and the secondary, which are 'one who has to be maintained, supported' and 'one who receives wages' respectively. In the first meaning the original value of the root *Bhr* predominates whereas in the second, the meaning is due to a derivative of the root *Bhr*, i.e., *bhriti* meaning 'wages, salary'.

In the epics, the word *bhritya* is used in the two senses. In the *Ramayana* the meaning of 'one who depends on someone else for maintenance, for support' is clear in II, 47-75 and 49-75

whereas in the case of Sumantra,[73] (the charioteer of King Dasharatha, one can think of the second meaning. Of course in the case of servants like Sumantra, who were most probably hereditary, the two senses seem to have merged into one. In the *Mahabharata* one can easily notice cases where it has the first meaning.[74] Taken along with the two other members of the compound it designates those who depend on someone else.

CHAPTER IV

SLAVERY IN THE BUDDHIST EPOCH

At the beginning of the Buddhist period we come across two types of state institutions. The first category, in which come the kingdoms of the Vajjis (federation of eight kingdoms), the Mallas, the Sakiyas, the Koliyas and the Bhaggas, consists of the oligarchies; the others are monarchies. The former are what we have earlier called the 'closed groups'. They constitute a sort of aristocratic oligarchy in which a whole section of the population inhabiting their territory is considered as the natural property of the rulers.[1] In the monarchies no section of the population is condemned as such to slavery. The most remarkable fact of this period is the disappearance, at first, of the oligarchies, and later, of the monarchies, as independent kingdoms, and their replacement by an empire ruling over the whole country.

We shall consider, first of all, the condition of slaves in the oligarchies and the monarchies, for which abundant details are furnished by the *Tipitaka*. We shall then examine the effect of the formation of an empire on the institution of slavery. The first thing to note in the oligarchies is the rigid social hierarchy where everything is decided according to the social group in which one is born. The political rights and privileges of a person depend only on the social group of his birth. Only those born in noble families, the Khattiyas as they were called in these oligarchies, could take part in political affairs. The right of entry into the *santhaagara* of the Sakiyas or that of bathing in the tank of the Licchavis symbolises the membership of the privileged groups. None who was not born a Khattiya could enter this hall or bathe in the tank. Even the knowledge of an Ambattha,[2] the prowess of a Bandhula[3] or the wealth of a Sudinna[4] could not change this situation. And even those who were born Khattiyas, could not ever hope to rise beyond a mediocre existence as the system of equal rights, having become a fetter on the society, put all on the same footing, making no

distinction between the brave and the coward, the learned and the ignorant and the enterprising and the do-nothing. That is why an ambitious youngman like Mahaali was obliged to leave the Licchavis and seek a living at the court of Pasenadi.[5] This pride in a noble birth had blinded them to such an extent that even the Buddha had to take the help of the supernatural to convince them of his personal superiority and to make them judge things better.

The rest of the people had no rights but that of being ruled and of working all their lives in the profession decided by their birth. The practice of regarding a whole section of the population as slaves fits in quite well, therefore, into the oligarchic system. In the monarchies, on the other hand, there is no such group, all of whose members are considered to be slaves. We believe that this practice ceased to exist with the defeat of the oligarchies. Henceforth slavery does not affect an entire group but only individual human beings. A man made prisoner in battle, or unable to pay his debts, etc., such are the possible cases. We propose to describe first the work at which the slaves were employed and later the changes that took place. In the oligarchies, slaves are mostly employed as domestic servants and as agricultural labourers. They cannot be recruited into the army, which is exclusively reserved for the Khattiyas. In the monarchies, they are employed as domestic servants, as agricultural workers, as servants with the merchants and as soldiers. We will first describe the conditions of agricultural work and of military service, obtaining on either side to take up the other two afterwards.[6]

1. THE OLIGARCHY AND THE MONARCHY

i) *The Army*

In a monarchy the ranks of the army of a king were open to everyone. We find slaves in the army who are called *dasaka-puttas*, 'sons of slaves'. The commentator calls them '*ghara-dasa yodhas*', slaves born in the household turned soldiers' and observes their affection (for the master).[7] Besides these domestic slaves, the kings commuted the death penalty of certain accused and enrolled them in the army.[8]

Slaves were also employed in the royal stables. Their fate was, in all probability, linked to that of the animals in their care, as is revealed by the transfer of the persons attached to an elephant.[9] According to a story, the prince made a gift not only of the elephant but also of the persons looking after it. Elsewhere we find people volunteering for work in the royal stables on condition that their life was spared.[10]

The army of an oligarchy, on the other hand, is exclusively composed of the nobles. All the available descriptions confirm this belief. In the tournament in which the young prince Gotama participated, his only opponents were the young Khattiyas.[11] Similarly, on his return from military training from Taxila, the young Bandhula demonstrates his skill at arms by fighting against only his cousins.[12] We may also mention that the quarrel regarding the distribution of the waters of the Rohini was only begun by the servant-slaves, the battle that followed was to be fought by the nobles alone.[13] In the invasion led by the king Vidudabha only the nobles of Kapilavatthu perished.[14] We may, therefore, conclude that the army of an oligarchy was composed exclusively of the nobles of the republic and that its ranks were closed to the slaves, as also to the artisans, merchants and Brahmins.

ii) *Agriculture*

We may distinguish various types of land workers in the monarchies. There are the wage labourers, the poor peasants who have only small bits of land, and others owning some acres. There are also the rich landowners owning hundreds of acres and sometimes entire villages. It is the rich peasants and landowners who employ slaves. Here are some details.

The Middle Peasant. In this group are included all those peasants who possess the necessary means of agriculture and who, sometimes, secure help outside their family, by acquiring a male or a female slave. It may also include those landlords who, having been reduced to poverty, are forced to work with their own hands. We are told the story of a peasant who owned a female slave, and of a rich family forced by poverty to give up all its slaves and servants retaining only one of them.[15] In such

families there is a personal relationship between the master and the slave and the latter are often well treated.

The Rich Landowners. These landlords possess hundreds of *karisas* of land, and sometimes several villages. Among them are found the Brahmins, the Setthis, and others. We also come across people who personally own the land. A Brahmin received his village from the King of Kasi with the privilege of exercising royal power over it.[16] The Setthi[17] Dhananjaya received 100 villages in heritage and owned, besides these, the others as *bhatta-gaama* (supposed to be exempt from taxes).[18] The accountant of a Setthi describing to his dying master the situation regarding his possessions mentions, 'villages, fields, cattle....'[19] We have also the Brahmin of Rajagaha, who has a big piece of land prepared for agriculture and the woman landowner who returns home after having the field sowed (*khettam vapaapetvaa*.[20] The son of the devout Maatika-maataa possessed a village in the territory conquered by the King of Kosala.[21] Yet again we find the treasurer of the king, the *raja setthi*, going to the field to supervise the harvest,[22] as also the two brothers getting a big field planted with paddy.[23] Patanjali, on his part, reveals the existence of such peasants when he speaks of one of them as supervising the work of five ploughs.[24]

Among these 'peasants' the land is cultivated by the slaves. If necessary wage labourers are also employed or the land is given to tenants.[25] This is confirmed by the mention of a *dasa-gaama*, 'village of slaves', near Banaras,[26] and that of 14 villages belonging to Pipphali-Maanava.[27] We may also recall the 500 bullock-carts full of agricultural tools and the hundreds of slaves received in dowry by Visaakhaa. Again, we have the case of the Brahmin Kosiya-gotta, who gives on lease half of his thousand *karisas* to tenants and leaves the rest to the care of his slaves and servants.[28] Overseers were employed to supervise the work of the slaves and other labourers, as for example, the man with a gold ring, who looked after the lands of the Setthi Sudatta Anatha-pindika,[29] or the man employed by the Setthi of Kosambi.[30]

In the royal territory new land was being constantly reclaimed. The valley of the Ganga was still covered largely with

forests which had that far not yielded to tools made of softer metals. The use of the iron axe permitted a *large-scale* felling of trees.[31] The areas thus cleared were made fit for agriculture by the use of the iron ploughshare.[32] This work is carried out by the slaves and the servants, as we see in the *Jataka* (iv. 167) where a Brahmin of Savatthi gets the trees felled and removed in order to reclaim the land for agriculture. Thus in the monarchies we find, besides wage labourers, poor and middle peasants, the latter possessing slaves. We also have landlords possessing vast areas of land which is partly exploited by the use of the labour of slaves.

In the oligarchies, on the contrary, slavery seems to have been, in spite of the insufficient data available, due to birth. The oligarchs possess slaves who must work for them. This fact is confirmed, above all, in agriculture, the principal industry (for commerce is not yet sufficiently developed) where the work is entirely carried out by slaves and servants. We are not contesting the existence of Brahmin villages (as for example among the Sakiyas)[33] mentioned in the texts, nor suggesting that these Brahmin peasants were the slaves of the Sakiyas. We are simply observing that the supply of foodgrains (rice, barley, etc.) to the noble families depended on the slaves who had to cultivate the lands of their masters. This is proved by a certain number of facts.

We have, first of all the case of the elder brother of the prince Anuruddha, who, having decided to renounce the world, explains the duties of the household to his younger brother in the following terms: 'It is necessary to *get* the land tilled and then *have* it irrigated. During irrigation water level must be the same everywhere. . . . Once the crop is ready it is necessary to *get* it harvested and to *get* the grain winnowed from the chaff.'[34] (Emphasis ours.) All these instructions are in the causative. Therefore, for the noble man, it is only a question of supervising the work.[35] This is further confirmed by the story in which the ignorance of the three princes of the Sakiyas is described: brought up in luxury and ignorant of worry, they do not even know where the rice comes from.[36] The only time these nobles put their hands to the plough is on the day called *vappa-*

mangala, when ploughing begins.[37] On the other days the nobles and their families have nothing to do but to amuse themselves, leaving all the work to the slaves, some of them coming occasionally to supervise the work. The slaves have to till the soil, sow the seed, irrigate and protect the fields, harvest the crops, etc. Everything has to be done by the slave so much so that, in a quarrel, the masters, coming to the help of their slaves, do not even know the origin of the quarrel. The Buddha, having come to pacify the two parties to the dispute (because, says he, 'the blood of a Khattiya is more precious than the water of the river Rohini') has to get the information about the dispute from the slaves. Nevertheless, the whole trouble was about the sharing of the waters for irrigation, something vital for the survival of the community since a drought would have seriously affected it.[38]

The defeat of the oligarchies was bound to have an effect in these two domains. As regards the army, the ruin of the oligarchies put an end to the arms monopoly of the nobles and gave the king the right to recruit soldiers from amongst the whole population. On the social plane, the effect must have been the breaking up of the system by which one group of people were condemned to be considered as slaves and the other group had the right to consider itself as master. We are not claiming that all the aristocrats disappeared or that all the slaves were freed. It is likely that some lands were given away to the king's favourites. We also know that some aristocrats continued to exist.[39] But henceforth, everything depended on royal pleasure and not on the fact of belonging to any particular social group. Broadly speaking, it is reasonable to think that the system existing in the conquered territories now resembled more that already established in the kingdoms and that the absolute power of the 'aristocratic' group came to an end. On the other hand, everyone, if he had the resources, could acquire slaves. This was a logical extension of the power of money.

Apart from these two aspects and the changes brought therein by the triumph of the kings, we now give some details regarding two other aspects, namely, domestic labour and service with the merchants.

iii) *Service in the Rich Households*

Here we shall consider together the palaces and the houses of the rich, separating them from the homes of people with moderate means. In the first section we shall give a sketch of all the functions in a palace carried out by slaves. We begin with the *nataka-itthis*, the dancing girls.

The Nataka-itthi. The harem of a prince consists of three types of women—the wives, the *nataka-itthis* and the suite. The possession of many wives, the *nataka-itthis* is a sign of wealth and prestige. In one story the parents of a prince declare that in view of their social position it is impossible for them to promise that they will have only one girl as daughter-in-law.[40] To hear of a harem having 16,000 women does not come as a surprise.[41] In the *Tipitaka*, a harem usually consists of 16,000 women.[42] Among these 16,000 one distinguishes 700 wives and the rest are called *nataka-itthis*.[43] In the *Chullasomajataka*, for example, 700 out of the 16,000 women are presented as *bhariyaas* or wives.[44] The chaplain who declines an offer of women says, 'I have forty wives...and many *nataka-itthis*', thus confirming our impression.[45] On the other hand, we learn that the monk *Ratthapala* had abandoned two principal wives and many *nataka-itthis*.[46] They are sometimes also designated by the name *nataka* or *nataki*.[47] Evidently these women do not have the status of wives.

Elsewhere, one speaks of their transfer from a master to his favourite, and even from father to son. The king Bimbisara, for example, offered one of his *nataka-itthis* to one of his sons.[48] A similar account is given in another story about a prince and his son.[49] In another story, the *nataka-itthis* themselves envisage their transfer to the son of their master when the latter becomes an ascetic and leaves the house.[50] Apart from these stories of princes, we have the case of a counsellor who transferred 500 of his *nataka-itthis* to his guest.[51]

These women surround their master when he goes to the court,[52] accompany him to the garden[53] and do everything to entertain him.[54] They are also his mistresses. Sometimes one comes across a hierarchy among them, where they are divided into *chulla nataka*, *majjihma nataka* and *jettha nataka*.[55] Their status must have been that of slaves as is established by the fact

that they are distinguished from the wives, they can be offered to another person and can be inherited.[56] However, not knowing how they were acquired, we are not in a position to say if all the *nataka-itthis* were slaves.

The Suite. Another function carried out by slaves and servants is that of the retinue. Every prince, as also every member of his family, had his personal retinue. The rich people also had their suites and gave one to each member of their family. In the *Vinaya* we come across a princely suite.[57] The queens received their suites from their husbands, like the three wives of the King Udena,[58] or the five wives of the King Okkaka.[59] We are told that the suite of a queen consists of women only.[60] In other texts one speaks of princesses with their suites going to visit the Buddha; such a suite consists of their companions and their *dasis*.[61] To show the importance he attached to his messenger, a prince would send a large retinue to accompany him as, for example, was done by Suddhodana.[62]

The retinue of a rich man would accompany him when he went on a visit or to have a walk.[63] The wives, like Visaakhaa, also had their retinues. Elsewhere, we have the case of a man who has his suite with him as he accompanies his wife to a convent.[64] The sons of an army chief had a retinue of a thousand men each.[65] Even the messengers sent by rich men, or kings, were accompanied by numerous attendants if they went on an important mission, like those going to fetch the daughter-in-law of their master.[66] The attendants never leave the master alone. Careful of his protection, they do not let anyone see him in private, except, of course, a *Bodhisatta* or the Buddha himself.[67] According to Kautalya a king must be guarded by armed women as soon as he quits his bedroom.[68] The queens are surrounded by attendants,[69] even in the bedroom.[70] A queen going on a journey is protected first of all by her suite.[71] The retinue accompanying a rich woman to the garden feels very happy hoping to have a good time eating and drinking.[72] In the houses of the rich these attendants look after everything; they bring water for the bath, make the bed and look after the mistress in case of illness[73], prepare perfumes and bath paste and make garlands. Some of them clean and sweep the house and carry the dirt out.[74]

The suite is designated by the word *parivara* or *parijana*.[75]

For suites composed exclusively of women the word *parivara-itthis*,[76] or simply *parichaarikaa* is used.[77] From the indications furnished by the *Tipitaka* we may conclude that the suites included slaves. In fact, the editors do not make any distinction between the word *parivara* and the words *dasa* and *dasi*, and often use them as synonyms. Here we have a lady 'bedecked in gold, surrounded by slaves, *dasiyo*.'[78] There we find another going to the garden 'accompanied by her slaves'.[79] The *dasiyo* of a princess, carrying out the orders of their mistress, turn out the thoughtless astrologers from her house.[80] Other incidents of a similar nature confirm this view. The men sent by Suddhodana to accompany his ten messengers became monks with their chief. According to Buddhaghosa the younger brother of Asoka renounced the world with a suite of a thousand men, and so also the younger brother of the King of Ceylon.[81] The sister of the latter was admitted to a convent accompanied by 500 *antepurikaas*, or women of the harem. A distinction is made between these women and 500 virgins and this shows that the women of the harem formed the suite.[82] We also know that other princes too were accompanied by their suites when they renounced the world.[83] We have, therefore, grounds to believe that at least a part of the suite consisted of male and female slaves.

The Valets.[84] The valets were chosen from amongst the suite. They were given the name of *paada-mulikas* 'One who is at the feet', or *attha-chaarika purisas*, 'one who carries out the intentions'. The first term indicates the degree of intimacy the valet enjoyed and the second relates to his functions.[85] *Pachchayika purisa*, 'special servant', is another name given to the valet.[86] For the women the name *atthachaarikaa itthi* is employed.[87] The girl-slave assigned to a girl who has reached the age of marriage is called *dasi* or *pesana-daarikaa*; the first defines her legal status and the second, meaning 'errand girl', her function.[88]

The valet is presented as a man of confidence and a counseller of the prince. The master counts on him in all his plots, his projects of false implications, abductions, crimes, or assassinations.[89] The women execute all jobs for their mistresses (queens, or rich women).[90]

The Wet-Nurses. The wet-nurses, or *dhatis* as they were called, had the task of bringing up the children. We do not know

much about their legal status, whether they were slaves or free servants receiving wages. One thing, however, is certain; the wet-nurse of a princess accompanies her for all her life and follows her to her husband's home. We have here something characteristic of slavery. The expression *dhati-dasi*,[91] 'slave-wet-nurse', cannot be taken, however, as a definite proof of their slave status. On the other hand, we find that Kautalya has slave women among the nurses.[92]

Since a queen did not bring up her children personally, they were suckled and brought up by the nurses. The custom of having the nurses bring up the princes was so well established that once the editors of the *Jatakas* had to press into service as nurses some *kinnaris* to bring up a prince born in the mountains.[93] Sometimes up to sixty-four nurses were employed for a single prince.[94] From time to time the kings assigned nurses to all the children born on the same day as the royal children. The children of the rich were also brought up in the same manner. We also find some people, imitating the kings, assigning a nurse to each boy born on the same day as their own child.[95] Girls were also looked after by nurses.[96]

We do not know at what time the boy was separated from his nurse, perhaps it was at the time of his weaning. On the contrary, nurses remain with the girl they have brought up and accompany her after the marriage to her new home.[97] In addition, even in the father's house, the nurse always forms part of the suite of her 'child', and we find her accompanying the princess when the latter visits her father or someone else.[98] The 'nurse mother'[99] looks after all the needs of the 'daughter' and watches over all that concerns her 'child'. We see one of them accompanying these slave women going to fetch water for the toilet of the mistress. The responsibility of the nurse was thus total and without limit. Because of the very nature of her function and the intimacy that the nurse had with her daughter', sincere affection was bound to grow up between the two. It is this sentiment that explains why such a nurse would sometimes help her 'child' to elope with her lover.[100] The authority that the nurse sometime exercised over her 'daughter' was a reward for her devotion.[101]

We may note that to be able to work as a nurse a woman had to be neither too tall, nor too white, etc. and her milk had to be sweet.[102]

That their function was regarded as unclean is evident from the fact that when attempts were made to display the human conditions as repulsive, frequent metaphorical use was made of their clothes as soiled with spit, mucus, urine and excrements'.[103]

The kitchen. The severest and the unhealthiest work done by slaves and servants, of both sexes, was probably that in the kitchen. In the description of a princely kitchen (belonging, however, to very ancient times when a prince only possesses earthen vessels) we meet a cook who 'is very tired...he cuts wood,' washes the utensils, fetches water...sleeps on the floor without any covering,...gets up early to cook the *yaagu* (a kind of soup)...carries it...serves it to all... and thus suffers a lot of hardship.'[104] Another kitchen, in the house of a rich man, was located on the ground floor. It was full of smoke turning all the people black and unrecognisable.[105] Two tasks intimately connected with the work in the kitchen are to fetch water in pitchers and to husk the rice. The women slaves charged with the water supply had to get up very early in the morning to go to the well or the river. This work went on throughout the year for water was indispensable.[106] Women slaves assigned to the task of husking rice had a very hard and tiring life. They too had to begin work early in the morning and sometimes worked till sunset, sometimes till late in the night. The body covered with sweat, they fall down tired and cease the work to get some fresh air outside.[107] There are special names given to these two functions of the *kumbha-dasi*,[108] and the *vihikottika-dasi* ('woman slave with the pitcher' and 'woman slave who husks the rice' respectively).

In another context, we come across a merchant who asks the slaves and servants to get up early to set the room in order, cut the wood, husk the rice and prepare the *yaagu*.[109] In the house of a master precepter a woman slave looks after the kitchen all alone.[110]

We may also note in passing that the Buddha laid emphasis upon the merit attached to serving the monks. All the devout

laymen are shown serving personally the Buddha, as also the monks (*'sa-hatthaa'*, 'with his own hands'[111]). This was probably the only task in which the slaves were helped by their masters.

The Dovarika. The guardian at the door, the *dovarika*, could be a slave as, for example, the one assigned by the Setthi Sudatta Anathapindika to guard the doors of a monastery.[112] The guardian is also called *khatta*. He receives the visitors and announces them to the master of the house.[113] The slave deputed at the threshold of a house washed the feet of the guest and led him to the interior of the house. The King of Magadha was received in this manner at the house of his treasurer.[114] Following the instructions received, the *dovarika* bars the entry into the house of any *'persona non grata'*, like, for example, the Jain monks coming to the house of the officer Siha,[115] or those coming to the house of Upaali.[116] The door-keeper controls not only the entry of visitors but also the exit of women, so much so that none of the wives can leave the house at her will.[117] According to the *Arthashastra*,[118] the King was received in the morning, at the fourth gate, among others, by door-keepers armed with lances.

Religious activity. We meet slaves and servants inviting the monks to the house of their master,[119] carrying food at the 'two ends of the bamboo' to the monastery accompanied by their master and/or mistress.[120] These domestics are also employed in the distribution of alms.[121] In the 'Brahmanic' sacrifices, it is again the slaves and the servants, who, 'forced by fear, the face bathed in tears', do all the manual work.[122]

The garden-keeper. We do not know if the keeper of the princely garden was a slave or a servant. In any case, he must have been one of the two as even the king's valets address him as a slave or servant, calling him *'bhane'*. He replies to them as to his master by addressing them as *'ajja'*.[123] The keeper is called *uyyaana-paala* or *aaraama-paala*.[124] On the eve of his master's visit he had to get the park evacuated by turning out all the people.[125] Sometimes he is asked to serve the monks who have come to the park as the king's guests.[126]

All this activity of the slaves and servants is under the supervision of men of confidence of the king or of the master of the

house. In the palace, a minister is responsible; in the homes of the rich, it can be a man or one of the slaves. The queen, or the mistress of the house, leaves the care of all the affairs to these overseers.[127] In the homes of people of moderate means, on the other hand, the women are obliged to share in the work of their slaves.

iv) *Service in Middle-class Households*

These households are mainly of owner-cultivators, of petty merchants, etc. The women of the household,—the wife, the mother, the daughter, the daughter-in-law—must personally carry out the duties of the household and have only a slave or two to help them.[128] We find a newly married woman preparing the food, or a wife cooking rice with meat for a friend of her husband.[129] In a country-family the wife prepares the food and sends it to the field through the slave.[130]

Ordinarily it is a slave who looks after the household. We have, for example, the slave Kali, who was 'clever at preparing the rice, making the beds, lighting the lamps....' and who 'was not only energetic but did not break the utensils also'. Every morning she got up early to milk the cows.[131] In another home, the women, that is the wife and her daughters, refuse to prepare food for a monk: it is prepared by the domestic slave, the *geha-dasi*.[132] Another *geha-dasi*, given the possibility of getting what she wants is content with a pestle, a mortar and a sieve.[133] The work done by these slaves is designated by the word '*dasi-bhoga*' which, according to Buddhaghosa, means 'work in the fields, removal of filth, fetching water', etc. *Dasi-bhoga* is opposed to *sunisaa-bhoga* which designates the work to be done by the daughter-in-law.[134] These two words put in contrast, describe clearly the domestic work in these families. Besides the slave working in the household, there were also wage labourers employed for seasonal work. And what is more interesting is the fact that in case of lack of work in the house these families would hire their slaves for work outside, to husk the rice for example.[135] In another *Jataka* we read the story of the slave who is beaten by her master for not having handed over to him the wage she had thus received.[136]

This is a summary of the functions of the slaves (of both sexes) employed for domestic labour. Although it is not possible often to decide whether such work was exclusively done by slaves, because the slaves and the servants are mentioned together, it is nevertheless certain that the slaves were given all these tasks. The use of woman-slaves in families with a moderate standard of living is also well established.[137] In conclusion we may state that in the domain of domestic labour there is no fundamental difference between the oligarchies and the monarchies. The number of rich households seems, however, to be greater in the kingdoms, and the number of slaves employed in domestic labour could, consequently, be greater too. But the difference would only be of a quantitative nature.

v) *Slaves Employed by Merchants*

Slaves, as well as servants, guarded the houses, accompanied the caravans of their master, and were responsible for all the tasks in this connection. It is they who went to look for gold when their master, the Setthi Sudatta Anathapindika, needed it to buy a park.[138] The slaves and the servants of the same Setthi went out to loot the caravan of another Setthi.[139] Another servant was, by his courage and perseverance able to dig a well in the desert, thus saving the entire caravan from destruction.[140] As an example of their devotion we may cite the case of the slaves and the servants who killed a prostitute responsible for the death of their master, a young merchant.[141] Sometimes obeying the order of their master, they follow the monks on the roads, to be able to serve them food.[142]

The nature of commercial activity was the same in the oligarchies and the monarchies. Consequently, there is no difference regarding the type of work done by the slaves employed by the merchants in these two regions. However, keeping in mind the greater importance of commerce in the kingdoms, in the beginning of the Buddhist Era, it is likely that slaves were more numerous in the monarchies. The destruction of the oligarchies could not, therefore, lead to any radical change in the condition of domestic slaves or of those employed by the merchants. The situation, as we have seen, was different in other fields of activity of slaves.

2. THE MONARCHIES AND THE EMPIRE

The consolidation of the two kingdoms of Kosala and Magadha, followed by the triumph of the latter resulting in the creation of an empire, was bound to have other repercussions on the institution of slavery. The disappearance of the petty kingdoms must have put an end to the raids carried out across the frontiers of a neighbouring state to capture men and women. The Pali term *kara-mara-aanita* may etymologically be interpreted as meaning 'a person captured by one who could kill him with his hands.' Since the raids preceded wars in social evolution, the word originally denoting a person captured during a raid, was later on used to denote a person captured in a battle. In the *Tipitaka* these two meanings of the word are still mixed up, that is to say, that the two types of slaves, grouped under a single name, exist together. In the *Arthashastra* and in other codes, on the other hand, raids are formally prohibited and only the slave taken prisoner in battle is named as such.[143]

The birth of the Magadhan empire, therefore, must have in principle, put an end to these raids inside the country. If it were so, then no slaves were captured in battle after the destruction of Kosala till the war of Kalinga when Emperor Asoka captured thousands of people.[144] We may also conjecture that the rich landowners had consolidated their economic power by getting their lands exploited by slaves and servants. We do not, of course, possess proof of this assertion, but we do not see any reason for which these people could have been forced to give up their privileges. We also know that even the kindest of the emperors, Piyadassi Asoka, did not think of abolishing slavery. Further, it is likely that the State, faced with new expenses of a highly centralised administration, was forced to take recourse to slave labour, by employing war prisoners to reclaim new land for the imperial farms. During this period, slavery has as its causes debts, famines, wars, legal punishment, etc.

We may also remark that the *Tipitaka* does not mention any law protecting the slave, limiting in some manner the absolute power of the master over his person. No distinction is made between slavery for life and for a fixed period, even though examples of the latter are to be found in the *Tipitaka* itself. Nor

are there any laws to protect children and woman-slaves. The slave is at the complete mercy of his master.

It may, however, be noted that, if, in the *Tipitaka*, the slave did not enjoy any legal protection, this was in conformity with the prevailing conception of slavery. The slave, being considered as a piece of property, had no right to possess anything.[145] The incidents where a slave is killed, or has his nose and ears cut without any punishment being meted out to the perpetrator are, therefore, quite understandable. We have, for example, the guardian of the field killed by his master in a fit of anger. The relations of the deceased could do nothing but weep.[146] A woman-slave had to sleep with the master; the jealous mistress beats her and cuts off her nose and ears in anger.[147] Another woman-slave thinks of committing suicide because of the ill treatment she receives at the hands of her mistress.[148] Finally, there is the case of the slave Kali, who deliberately provoked the anger of her mistress and suffered a head injury as a result. All that she could do in return, was to complain about it in the neighbourhood.[149]

In the *Tipitaka* we do not find any instance of punishment of the master accused of maltreating his slaves. We may remark, however, that a current of opinion in favour of the slave had already begun during the life of the Buddha, and did, probably, play its part in the evolution of the rights of the slave. The slave Kali, who was injured in the head, caused a loss of reputation of her mistress by complaining among the neighbours. The slave who had tried to commit suicide was saved by the Buddha who intervened effectively on her behalf with her master. In the case of the slave who lost her ears and nose, the Buddha expressed his disapproval. Apart from this disapproval the Buddha also emphasised the importance of the work of the slaves and servants. For him the slaves and the servants constitute the 'low sector of society', *hetthimaa disaa;* that is to say, in his thought, not exactly 'inferior' but rather 'of the base'.[150] Often he advised his rich listeners to look after the well-being of their slaves and servants.

In this context Asoka's exhortation to his people to treat the slaves well (*dasa-bhatakamhi samya pratipatti.*[151]) is only a

logical consequence of the teaching begun earlier by the Buddha himself.

We may also note that the *Tipitaka* usually juxtaposes the words *ariya* (noble, master) and *dasa* (slave), as for example in *ariya-vohaara* and *dasa-vohaara*.[152] In all these cases, the word *ariya* signifies (in the legal sense) a free man as opposed to the *dasa* meaning slave.[153]

To judge by the well-known example of Pataachaaraa[154] and of the mother of the monk Chulla-panthaka,[155] it seems well established that if a girl eloped with a slave of her parents, only the slave, and not the girl, had to fear punishment.

This is the framework in which we propose to examine the relevant facts available in the *Tipitaka*, adding to them the information given in other texts like the *Nirukta*, the *Mahabhashya* and the *Dharma-sutras*.

3. SOME REMARKS ON THE IDEOLOGICAL

We intend to discuss here the attitude of the master towards the slave, especially towards the work performed by the latter, and that of the slave towards his master as depicted in the Pali canon. We will also take note of the attitude of the Buddha and try to show the position assumed by him on this difficult question. To some the treatment may not appear to be adequate but we do hope to provoke some interest in the question as the facts presented here have seldom been shown in this light.

For the master, the slave and the servant are an additional burden, whom he is bound to support just as he has to support the members of his family and other dependents. Here is, for example, a master, a rich Brahmin complaining about his lot: 'How can we be care-free, when we have to (exert ourselves to) support our parents...our slaves, servants and other dependents.'[156] The master thinks that the slave apart, even the *kammakara*, the wage-labourer, does not evince any interest in the work assigned to him and waits for the end of the day and

* The material under this section has also been utilised by us for an article published in the *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, June, 1959.

the payment of the wage without bothering in the least about the successful completion of the work.[157] In spite of all the care the master may take of his serving-folk, he does not get any willing work out of these people. He himself may toil all day, yet these people, who are paid and/or maintained by him, try their best to shirk work. The master sighs for a slave-servant who takes the master's work to be his own, who guards his master's property as if it were his own precious possession. But no matter how he looks after them, they seldom respond to so good a behaviour. These people bother only about their own requirements and although apparently very obedient, dutiful and attentive in the presence of the master, they simply do not care once the master turns his back on them. In this connection we may read the thoughts of yet another master who complains as follows:

'O *Bhante*, our slaves...do another thing with their bodies, say another with their speech and have a third in their mind.'[158] Explaining this passage, the commentary says: 'On seeing the master, they rise up, take things from his hands; discarding this and taking that others show a seat, fan him with a hand-fan, wash his feet, thus doing all that needs be done. But in his absence, they do not even look even if oil is being spilled, they do not turn to look even if there were a loss of hundreds or thousands to the master. (This is how they behave differently with the body.)... Those who in the master's presence praise him by saying, "Our master, our lord", say all that is unutterable, all that they feel like saying once he is away. (This is how they behave differently in speech.'[159]

Of course there are exceptions such as the slave Kaaka of the King of Ujjeni, who could cover sixty *yojanas* in a day,[160] or the woman-slave Kali Savatthi,[161] who was 'clever, agile and successfully looked after the domestic chores'. Such serving-folk furnish the analogy for a verse in the *Cariyapitaka*,[162] wherein it is said that a *sevaka*, come to a master to earn his living, concentrates his body, speech and mind in the service of his master. Another such good worker is Punnaa or Punnikaa,[163] who later got manumitted and became a nun. Now what have such people to say about the nature of their work? Punnaa being a *kumbhadasi*, had to fetch water all the year round, morning, noon and night. This is a painfully tough job, especially in winter when she had to enter water in the morning and even at night if water was required at home. But she says that she could not afford to

fail at her job because of the threats that were held out to her, because of the abuse showered on her. We may note that this was the case with a master who was a devoted Buddhist. (But in the absence of a well nearby, the master could not have helped being strict, as in the climate of our country, water is much more necessary and needed in greater quantities than say, in Europe.) The story of Kali leaves no room for doubt. She used to be the apple of the eye of her mistress and everybody was full of praise for the mistress who treated her woman-slave so well. Kali, being somewhat clever, sensed that it was all due to the promptness, the agility with which she worked. In order to confirm her feeling, she started being late and negligent in her work. The whole picture changed immediately and in no time Kali received a severe thrashing, making it clear that the only safe way for such people was to be absolutely conscientious in their work, which repeated every day became domestic drudgery (sometimes even good work was no protection, as in the case of the woman-slave Rajjumaalaa).[164]

If these workers, women-slaves, who were considered good hands, could have no other motive for being conscientious than the threat of force, we may assume that the same could apply to a very large section of the serving people. In an oft-repeated passage, we are told that the *dasa-kammakaras* deputed to work in a sacrifice, a performance where all work is meritorious, worked under duress, under the menace of punishment, of fear, 'with tears on their faces, weeping, they go about their jobs'.[165] This element of compulsion in extracting manual work is emphasised in a commentary-passage, where it is said that a slave must cease participating in a festival if his master so desires and go running after the errand assigned to him; otherwise he runs the risk of being beaten or being mutilated. Here is a free rendering of the passage in question:

> A slave, enjoying himself on a festival-day, leaves everything and goes running where he is told to go (by his master) on hearing that something urgent has got to be done, and that he must go there at once, failing which his hands, feet, ears or nose may be cut. Such a slave has no idea of the beginning, middle or end of the festival-day.[166]

Of course, here a servant fares better, as being a wage-labourer he is free to participate in such festivals (they were

the only holidays), and he ran no such risks. But precisely because he was a wage-labourer, he could ill-afford to have a day off. Thus in one story,[167] a *kammakara* refuses to enjoy a festival as he preferred to go and work for his master, because he had to procure the day's wherewithal for himself and his family. Elsewhere a rich man, disguised as a labourer, has this to say of a festival-day, 'Mother, I can barely get along on the wages that I earn. What shall I do. . .' (i.e., cannot afford a holiday.)[168] Here we may mention a remark attributed to another *kammakara* who says that once in a while a slave can afford to refuse work by pretending to be unwell, but a servant cannot have even this luxury as by so doing he loses his wages for the day.[169]

Obviously, in this mutual opposition between the two sides, there is not much of a common meeting ground. It will be, therefore, well to examine here the attitude of the Buddha, as by renouncing his worldly ties of a nobleman, he had cut off all connection with either of the two parties and had no longer any 'vested interests' (as one may put it today) in the whole question. But before coming to this aspect, we would like to see another side of the same problem, wherein it is possible to find some common meeting ground between these two, apparently hostile points of view. This meeting-ground is provided by their agreement on the dislike of all manual work. Both the master and the slave-servants consider it an imposition and would like to get on without it. The difference is that the masters have been able to escape it almost entirely by throwing the burden on the shoulders of their serving-folk. This freedom of the masters from manual work is well-rendered in the idealized picture of a nobleman who says of himself:

> Monks, I was delicately nurtured, exceedingly delicately nurtured, delicately nurtured beyond measure. For instance, in my father's house lotus-pools were made thus: one of blue lotuses, one of red, another of white lotuses, just for my benefit. No sandal-wood-paste did I use that was not from Kasi; of Kasi-cloth was my turban made,. . .my jacket, my tunic and my cloak. By night and day a white canopy was held over me, lest cold or heat, dust or chaff or dew touch me. Moreover, monks, I had three palaces, (for winter, for summer and for rains). In the four months of rains I was waited upon by minstrels, women all of them. I came not down from my palace in these months. . . .[170]

Since the masters are thus able to save themselves from the

obligation of manual work, it is but natural that the serving-folk be obliged to undertake it entirely.[171] This is why the latter resent it all the more. Once in a while we learn about a slave or a servant, asking himself as to why there is such a difference between himself and his master. Such a person is represented as asking himself: Here is this king, Ajatasattu—he is a man, so am I. But he lives in the full enjoyment of his senses whereas I, his slave, work for him, rise before him to carry out his orders.[172]

This attitude to manual work as an imposition is in contrast with the view expressed in an earlier epoch, in the *Rigveda*, where there is no expression of any dislike of manual work. This is in part at least, due to the absence of the division of labour as seen in the well-known verse describing various jobs (intellectual and manual) undertaken by members of one and same family.[173]

This dislike for manual labour expressed in the Pali literature goes hand in hand with the more or less complete (using the term in a relative sense) division of labour that has already taken place. Obviously this division of labour must have occurred at an earlier date, as the contempt for manual labour has already produced some strange results. In contrast with the reaction of the serving-folk who consider manual labour, *kamma*, to be an imposition, the upper stratum of society which lives by appropriating the major part of the production achieved by the manual labour of these serving-folk, shows itself to be sick of life itself (and some of them, at least, are quite sincere about it). To such people the very act, *kamma*, of breathing, of living is an imposition and they are keen to get out of this cycle of birth and death. This has already become the prevailing ideology and even the lower strata of the population, in their eagerness to escape the double burden of heavy manual work and the burden of life itself, are said to have directed their efforts in the direction of the renunciation of worldly desires leading to the liberation, *moksha* from the world, from transmigration.[174] For the first stage, i.e. the renunciation of all desires, we have the simile of a servant, keen to see the end of his work-day, with *no* desire, *no* attachment to the work (of his master).[175] For the second, i.e. after the renunciation of desires, we have the simile of the freed slave who is feeling happy and at ease because he is no

longer a victim of the *kilesas,* sufferings, of which the slaves are ordinarily the victims.[176]

The Buddha was, willy nilly, forced to show some interest in the problem as his Order comprised persons coming from all ranks of life and his following of lay-devotees was also similarly constituted. We have, already, referred to cases where the Buddha had intervened personally to mediate between the slaves and the masters.[177] The situation was not very encouraging as there was widespread contempt for all those who were engaged in manual work and that is why the slaves and the servants were such a despised lot. This contempt comes to the surface in the story of Nanda, a cousin of the Buddha himself. He was persuaded to stay a monk only after he had been promised 500 *accharaas*, fairies in heaven. On learning of the same, his fellow-monks made fun of him saying that by agreeing to stay a monk on the promise of a reward, he had reduced himself to the status of a wage-labourer, a *bhataka.*[178] Moreover, even a remote connection with a slave could change the popular attitude towards a person so accused. In the case of Ambattha, for example, who was a learned Brahmin youth, coming from a reputed Brahmin family, his friends were scandalised on learning that the founder of this family had been the son of a slave-woman. According to the commentary, they refused to stand by him lest the Buddha should reveal similar unpalatable facts about them also.[179]

Unable to undertake any radical change in the society as a whole, the first thing he did was in his own Order of the monks. There he issued orders that no former slave, who had entered the Order was to be called by his former name. Moreover, he listed certain names as being names held in contempt (they were associated with slaves) and said that no one was to be called by any of these names.[180]

As far as the society was concerned, when asked to give his opinion on servant-master relations, as in his discourse to some young girls, he advised them to have a correct attitude vis-a-vis the serving people. The *dasa-kammakaras,* he said, should have work assigned to them according to their capacity and should be well looked after when ill, etc.[181] Elsewhere the desirability of properly treating the serving people is brought out when it is said that a *silavati* woman behaves correctly towards her slaves

and servants.[182] It may not be out of place to repeat here the description of the six quarters given by the Buddha, where he places these people in the lower quarter, the *hetthimaa disaa*.[183] This can be interpreted either as an expression of contempt for the lowly or as an expression of the important place they occupied in the social set-up. In view of the Buddha's general attitude towards such people, it is legitimate to say that in this case, the second interpretation would be nearer his thoughts. (The commentary says that this lower quarter is situated where the feet are, where the base, *patitthaana* is.)

In another story he is said to have gone even further and said that instead of sacrificing to the fire every day and feeling satisfied for having performed the duty of an *agnihotrin*, it is much better to consider the satisfaction of one's dependents, including the *dasa-kammakaras*, as the better form of fire-sacrifice and to consider that it is these people who constitue the household fire.[184] In fact he is even a bit more emphatic, when he says that in a house where among others the *dasa-kammakaras* do not get their food on time, work is not done properly[185] and loss is the result of such neglect. On the other hand a satisfied slave or servant is an asset. He advises a good master to treat his serving-folk by assigning them work according to their strength, by giving them food and wages, by tending them in sickness,[186] by sharing with them unusual delicacies, by granting them leave at times. Thus treated, they rise before him and go to bed after, they are content with what is given to them, they do their work well and carry about his praise and good fame.[187]

On the other hand he advised the slaves to bear patiently with their lot and explained the same as follows. If a person is born a slave, it is the consequence of some bad acts of an earlier life[188] and the best way for him is to submit willingly to his lot. He should submit to all sorts of treatment at the hands of his master and should never allow any feeling of revenge to grow within himself, even if the other should try to kill him.[189] In such cases, a change of destiny is promised to the slave in the next birth. He is promised the status of a god with all the comforts that go with it.[190] In case, however, such a person is lucky to obtain manumission from his master, he may obtain ordination and thus try to secure salvation from the cycle of transmigration,

i.e. release from the slavery of life and death. Of course, in this case he must, first of all, obtain release from desires, become free from them as a slave who obtains freedom from his lot.[191]

Thus while he tries to bring home to the masters the necessity and the desirability of a contented serving class, he also does not forget to tell the latter that their salvation lies in complete submission to the former. That he derived his conclusion from the widely accepted belief in the theory of *karma*, of the retribution of acts need not be stressed again and again. To him and to his followers birth in a particular group was the consequence of certain good or evil acts. Since the retribution was believed to be inexorable, unvarying, like the working of a machine, he could not but advocate complete submission to one's destiny. This would ensure a better lot at least in the next life. The results of such a policy, if widely followed, are not difficult to guess. With the majority of the serving-folk becoming obedient, ready to carry out all the orders of their masters, life in society would become wonderful (for the masters). But then, what was the need for such an emphasis at that time? One reason, in our opinion, was the social unrest that prevailed in those times. We are apt to forget that the social system in which the Buddha had been brought up was on its last legs.[192] Due importance has not so far been given to the revolt (the reference is extremely brief)[193] of the slaves of the Buddha's own tribe (after he had renounced the world), in which the slaves had been at first successful and in which they had carried away some of the womenfolk, the *kula-itthiyo*, the *kula-dhitaayo*, the *kula-sunhaayo* (married women, unmarried daughters and the daughters-in-law of high families) of their masters. If this revolt were the only incident of its kind, perhaps the Buddha might not have reacted the way he did. He was too intelligent a person to be carried away by an isolated event. But from other references we learn that all around him the lower orders were astir. Thus among the Vajjis, the people oppressed by the tyranny of the rulers were wont to seek shelter and attack the settled areas therefrom.[194] That a man of non-aristocratic origin, (we refer to Bandhula) could successfully challenge and hold at bay the vainglorious Licchavis, could not have escaped his notice. This is probably why he advocated a policy of peace, by stressing upon both the

necessity of observing a sort of a code of conduct. Of course we must concede that for a person sincerely believing in the principle of *karma,* such extraneous considerations need not be of any vital importance and we may agree that the Buddha (from what we learn about him in the *Tipitaka*) sincerely believed in it. But even from this angle it is clear that disobedience on the part of a slave or servant was considered as an evil act. The same view was held of bad treatment on the part of a master.[195]

This is the framework in which we intend to analyse and arrange the data on slaves and slavery. In the next chapter we proceed with the discussion of such facts as the definition of *dasa* and *dasi,* their origins, their categories, their prices, their appearance and dress, modes of manumission, etc.

CHAPTER V

DATA RELATING TO SLAVERY

1. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF 'DASA' AND 'DASI'

i) *Dasa*

According to the *Digha Nikaya*, a *dasa* 'is not master of himself, depends on another and cannot go where he likes.' (That is, he is not free to act according to his pleasure and has to act according to the will of his master. In fact, he has to depend for his very life on the sweet will of his master.) In another context we are told that the master has full powers over his slave, can beat him and even kill him, if he so choses.[1] The sense is made clearer by the definition of the word, *bhujissa*, antonym of the word, *dasa*. A *bhujissa* 'is independent, has no one for his master and acts as it pleases him.' To this definition, Buddhaghosa adds '*attano santako*', master of himself.[2] Commenting on the phrase, *yathaa dasa bhujissam patthenti*, 'as the slaves prefer (desire) to be *bhujissas*,' he remarks: 'As the *bhujissas*, the free men, do what they like, as no one can forcibly prevent them from doing so, the slaves desire the state of free men.' By purchasing one's liberty, a slave can 'do what pleases him'.[3] The state of slavery, it may be added, is known as *dasavya*, *dasabya*, *dasatta* or *dasattha*. Another term is *dasabhoga*.[4]

The absence of all rights is the chief criterion of slavery. This is underlined in the text where the authors describe the duty of the slave to obey his master, to work even on the day of a festival if his master so demands.[5] From the legal point of view, the slave is not a human being, but an object. Everything possessed by him, whether it be small or big, is the property of the person who owns him, as the slave 'neither possesses his own self, nor any goods; these latter belong to his master.'[6] In fact, a commentator includes the *dasas* among movable goods like the livestock.[7] Here we may note that a group of *dasas* is called *dasa-gana*.[8]

ii) *Dasi*

The word *dasi* designates a 'woman-slave'. This is confirmed by the use of the word *bhujissaa* as an antonym of the word *dasi*: '*bhujissaa*, that is to say, having been liberated from the pains of slavery, she has become *bhujissaa*'.[9] A woman-slave is also known as *dasika* or *dasiya*[10] and a group of woman-slaves is called *dasi-gana*.

iii) *Etymology*

The *Tipitaka* furnishes us with no other explanation. No effort has been made in these texts to explain the etymology of the word '*dasa*'. On the other hand, Yaska, in his *Nirukta*[11], derives this word from the root *das*, which signifies 'finish', 'terminate'. He explains it as follows: 'He is called a *dasa*, as he finishes the (various) jobs.'

According to Durga, a man is called *dasa*, as he finishes, terminates the (various) jobs such as agricultural ones.[12]

2. CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO MANNER OF ACQUISITION

The *Vinaya* enumerates three types of slaves, i.e. (i) *antojatako*, (ii) *dhanakkito* and (iii) *kara-mara-anito*.[13] According to the commentary, one born of a slave-woman is known as *antojatako*, one purchased is *dhanakkito* and one brought from another country and made slave is *kara-mara-anito*.[14] In the *Digha-nikaya*, a fourth type, known as *Samam dasavayam upagato* is added. This stands for 'one who has, himself, accepted to be slave'.[15] In the *Tipitaka*, whenever one has to mention types of slaves, these four types alone are referred to. In the *Niddesa*, for example, these four types of slaves are referred to while enumerating various types of property. In the *Jataka* commentary, however, another type is added, namely *aamaaya daasaa ti bhavanti eke*, 'Some are slaves born in the house'.[16] Clearly this is another term for the *antojatako* referred to above. On making a comparison one can say that possibly the list of the *Digha-nikaya* (4 types) is later than that of the *Vinaya* (3 types). One can reasonably envisage a certain stage of law, more ancient, where there were only two types of slaves, i.e. the slave of war,

taken from outside one's own group, and the slave of poverty (debt, famine, etc.) made inside the group itself.[17]

Examples of the Vinaya-List

i) *Born in the house.* Channa, the *bhikkhu*, was born in the house of Suddhodana, the chief of the Sakiyas[18] as also Dasaka, another *bhikkhu*, born in the house of the Setthi Sudatta Anathapindaka.[19] The slave Nanda is said to have been born of a slave-woman[20], as also the slaves Katahaka and Kalanduka.[21] The slave Kaaka was born of a slave-woman of the king Pajjota.[22]

It may be noted that in the *Digha-nikaya*, the term, *dasi-putto*, 'son of a woman-slave' is explained as '*ghara-dasiyaa putto*', 'son of a woman-slave of the house'.[23] The term, '*dasa-daaraka*', 'son of a slave', refers also to the 'slave born in the house'. However, when this word signifies a 'child-slave', it can be used as an example of another type.[24] Patanjali employs the term *dasera* to denote a 'son of a woman-slave', and the term '*daasyaah kaamukah*', 'lover of a slave-woman', to designate a person having sexual relations with a woman-slave.[25]

As regards *dasis* the example of an *antojata* is furnished by Vaasabha Khattiyaa, born of a slave-woman of the Sakiyas.[26] The term *geha-dasi*, 'slave-woman of the house', as also its synonym, *ghara-dasi*, also designate the 'slave-woman born in the house'. The term, *amaya-dasi* is used in the same sense.[27] It will, perhaps, be not out of place to assimilate the inherited slave in this category and mention that according to certain Sanskrit texts,[28] woman-slaves inherited in common by a number of brothers from the father, should not be divided like other goods. Vijnaneshvara[29] refers in this connection to Manu, (IX. 219), which says that, among other things, women (-slaves) should not be divided and gives as his opinion that inherited woman-slaves, if unequal in number to the number of inheritors, should not be divided by means of pricing, but should be made to work in turn.

ii) *Purchased slave.* The poor old Brahmin of the *Vessantara Jataka* did not know how to obtain slaves as he possessed neither money nor skill. Yet he was pestered by his young wife to obtain at least one for doing the domestic chores.[30] The term, '*satak-kitaa dasi*', 'slave-woman purchased for hundred pieces of

money' (the metal is not specified), as also the expression, *satena kito daso*, 'slave purchased for hundred pieces,'[31] confirm the existence of this type of slaves. Another story also confirms the possibility of purchase; here the grandfather had been able to buy back the children given away in slavery by their father Vessantara.[32]

iii) *Slave of war.* The *Baka-Brahma Jataka* tells us the story of a raid in which some persons were carried off as slaves. Elsewhere we come across a minister (of the king) who in return for a part of profits, took no action against such raids carried out by the bandits.[33] Women captured in this fashion are the heroines of two *Jatakas*. One of them is described as 'young and pretty'; the other, a virgin, was able to run away and find shelter with an ascetic.[34]

iv) *Voluntary slave.* This type of slavery was not absolutely voluntary. In such cases, decisions were taken under the pressure of some circumstance which forced the victim to renounce his liberty. A slave of war is under the direct force of his captor, whereas a voluntary slave is not under the force of someone else; here the legal renunciation of liberty is a function of external causes, such as debt.

People caught in an epidemic offer themselves as slaves to Jivaka, the famous physician, if only he were to treat and cure them.[35] The merchants and the princes, who offer themselves as slaves in return for their lives have also to be included in this category.[36] As regards women, we have the example of the mother who offered herself as slave in return for the cure of her eye-disease,[37] and the prostitute who thus tried to save her life.[38] Here we may refer to the passage in the *Milinda-panho*,[39] where it is said that a father gives away his children into slavery when he has too many of them and cannot bring them up properly. He may, says the same text, give a child away, if he does not like that particular child. The same for the wife.

Other Types

It is interesting to note that there is no mention of any other type of slavery as such in the *Tipitaka* although there is mention of slaves belonging to categories other than the four referred to above. We can refer, in this case, to persons reduced to slavery

as a result of a judicial decision, these cannot be included in any of the types mentioned above. It is possible, therefore, that the *Vinaya*-list of three types and the other one of four types, refer to some ancient law-codes, where the latter may or may not have been contemporary of the former one. The editors of the Pali texts have simply incorporated these two existing lists and have not prepared a new list of their own. Had they prepared a new list, it would have been longer than either of these two. We now propose to record those cases of slavery which cannot be included in these four categories.[40]

i) *Judicial punishment.* A prince orders that the superintendent of one of his villages be made the slave of persons, falsely accused of crime.[41] A teacher saves the life of one of his ex-pupils, sentenced to death, by accepting him as his slave. Three ministers, in another story, are condemned to become the slaves of their fourth colleague. As regards women condemned to slavery, we have the story where five hundred of them are made to serve their co-wife as her slaves.[42] The *Milinda-panho*[43] tells us that a husband could 'kill, imprison or enslave' his adulterous wife. Here it may be mentioned that in ancient Indian society, a father had every right to dispose of his wife (or wives) and children as he liked. He could, therefore, give them in slavery. In Pali literature, the best example of the same is furnished by the King Vessantara, who gave away his wife, Maddi, and two children into slavery.[44] This can be juxtaposed with the story of the King Harishchandra, who sold his wife and child into slavery in the holy town of Kasi. This power of the father is given a juridical covering in the famous *Smriti* verse which lays down that the son, the wife and the slave have no claim to property. All that they possess belong to their possessor, namely, the father, the husband or the master.[45] We have also the more ancient examples of the King Somaka, who offered his only son in a sacrifice[46] and of the King Shivi, who gave a dish prepared with the flesh of his son to a *Rishi*.[47]

ii) *Slaves as gift.* In one story a king donates some of his slaves to a Brahmin and in another the prince Vessantara gives away in donation, seven hundred slaves, men and women.[48] Later he gave away his two young children as slaves. Elsewhere a Brahmin demands and receives 'seven hundred' woman-slaves

from a prince whereas in another story, a Brahmin sends back four hundred woman-slaves offered to him.[49] The case of two slaves received by Jivaka[50] can be considered as an example of purchase as he had received them as part of his fees.[51]

iii) *Gambling*. A prince puts his ablest minister on a wager and loses him. This minister was his slave and, therefore, could be treated as a piece of property. Having been thus 'lost', he has to accompany his new master.[52]

3. CLASSIFICATION ACCORDING TO FUNCTIONS

The terms referred to above divide the slaves according to the manner of their acquisition, their origin. There are, besides, other terms which designate slaves in accordance with their activities. Once in a while such a term indicates their owner. We will describe men-slaves, woman-slaves and the two together.

Man-slaves

i) *Dasaka-puttaa*. This term is found in a list of professions and trades and is explained as *balava-sinehaa ghara-dasa-yodhaa,* that is 'soldier-slaves, born in the house and full of loyalty' (for their master).[53] This shows that child-slaves used to be brought up for their eventual recruitment as soldiers.

ii) *Dasi-putta*. This term has alrealy been explained as 'son of a woman-slave'. It is also utilised as a term of abuse, as is the case in the *Setaketu Jataka*.[54] Sometimes other words are added to it so as to enhance its abusive value, as in the case of *chandaala-dasi-putta*. The terms *dasi-puttrah* or *dasyaah-puttrah* found in the *Mahabhashya,* serve the same purpose.[55] As is to be expected, even the plain word *dasa* has something insulting about it.[56] The same is true of the compound word, *duttha-dasa*.[57] The bad sense of the word *samana-dasa,* 'slave of a *bhikkhu*' is due to the word *dasa*.[58]

Here we may note that according to Kautalya (V. 2) it is a crime to call anyone a *dasa* or *dasi*.[59]

iii) *Kammanta-dasa*. This term denotes a slave working in a place of work (field, workshop, shop) or acting as a superintendent of others in any such place.[60]

iv) *Pesakara-dasa* and v) *Rajaka-dasa*. These two terms

are found in the *Samanta-Pasadika*[61] and denote men-slaves doing the work of a weaver and a washerman respectively.

v) *Sudda-dasa.*[62] This term, in our opinion, denotes 'slave belonging to a *Sudda* (*Shudra*)' but it can also denote 'a slave who is a *Sudda*'. However, Buddhaghosa gives the first interpretation and remarks:

> The nobility of birth has reference only to the Brahmins and the Khattiyas, the nobility of colour (white colour?) has reference to the Brahmins, the Khattiyas and the Vessas but material prosperity can be possessed even by a Sudda. . . .[63]

Hence the inference that even a *Sudda* can own slaves.

vi) *Bhikkudasa.* It seems that in the Chinese Turkestan, during the early centuries of the Christian Era, certain Buddhist monks held other monks as slaves, the latter being known as *Bhikkhudasas.*[64]

Woman-slaves

i) *Kula-dasi.* It can be translated as a woman-slave of a family with this restriction that the word *kula*, 'family', is used to denote only highly placed families. This sense of *kula* becomes clear in cases where it is used in conjunction with some words in one single context, such as *kula-itthi*, *kula-dhitaa*, *kula-dasi*, (married women, unmarried girls and women-slaves of high families) etc.[65] In the *Tipitaka*, *kula* generally denotes only such families. Sometimes one comes across woman-slaves owned by families who were not very rich. They had one or two woman-slaves, *kula-dasis.*[66]

ii) *Nati-dasi.* This term is explained as *natinam dasi* but as the sense of the word *natinam* is obscure, it is difficult to explain its meaning. According to the context, however, it denotes a woman-slave working in a rich household.[67]

iii) *Deva-dasi.* This term is used only by Buddhaghosa, who utilises it to explain the term, *deva-panha*, 'divine interrogation'. According to him, 'the Buddha does not interrogate the *deva-dasi* fallen under the spell of a god.'[68] We can infer herefrom that the practice of consecrating *deva-dasis* was prevalent, at least in the time of Buddhaghosa. This custom of donating young virgin girls to a temple-god has been well known in India,[69] although the *Tipitaka* does not mention it. In this case

Buddhaghosa has probably introduced a concept which was alien to the Buddhist circles. (The Pali texts describe the *chetiyas* and not the temples.[70] In one case we are told of a family which accepted to work as the slave of one such monument.[71]) As regards the problem of *deva-dasis* under the spell of a god, let us note that gods do not 'visit' only a certain type of women and in any case we can explain the term *deva-panha* as follows: 'interrogating a god by putting questions to a person (usually a woman) under the spell of that god.'

iv) *Vanna-dasi.* In the *Jatakas* we come across seven hundred *vanna-dasis* belonging to a minister.[72] Elsewhere, eight *vanna-dasis* go to fetch water from a well which is required for their mistress.[73] In these two cases, it is clearly the work of the *kumbha-dasis* (see below). The devout Visaakhaa had received a group of those as part of her dowry. Her father had asked them to wait upon his daughter at the time of her toilet.[74] These references apart, we come across this term, when it refers to a prostitute.[75]

v) *Kumbha-dasi.* The 'slave of the pitcher' had to fetch water for their masters.[76] The woman-slave Punnaa,[77] worked in this way. The hardship of this work is compared with that of the monastic life.[78] The woman-slave Punnikaa, as also her mother, were slaves of the pitcher.[79]

The word has a pejorative sense when it is used to denote a woman of pleasure. According to Buddhaghosa, a woman-slave of the pitcher is pretty, she dances and sings well.[80] In the opinion of Malalasekhara, the mother of the slave Bijaka was a *kumbha-dasi*, 'a prostitute'.[81] In the list of professions given in the *Apadana*, the *ganikaa* and the *kumbha-dasi* are juxtaposed.[82] This is probably an example of the use of this word in its pejorative sense.[83]

vi) *Vihi-kottika dasi.* In the *Jataka*[84] a certain woman-slave is described as the 'woman-slave who husked rice.' In another story, we are told of a woman slave who worked for hire and who used to husk rice.[85] In these cases, they are woman-slaves working for their respective owners. Elsewhere also we come across examples of hiring out slaves when we read of a woman-slave whom her master had been beating because of non-payment of wages received by her.[86] In contrast with the fami-

lies owning one or two woman-slaves, there are other houses, rich ones, where a woman-slave is exclusively employed for husking rice. In view of the large quantity that must have been required, she had to work her pestle all day long, continuing this work sometimes even after sunset.[87] That this hard work had been the lot of certain women-slaves from ancient times becomes clear from the reference to the smearing of mortar and pestle by a wet-handed *dasi*.[88]

vii) *Dasi ca bhariya ca.* Among the seven or ten types of wives mentioned by the *Tipitaka*[89] the last one is the 'slave-wife.' This is the case of a woman-slave who has been promoted to the rank of wife.[90] Similarly Patanjali mentions the 'slave-wife of Devadatta,' *Devadattasya dasa-bharya*.[91] The *Dharmasutras*, for their part, consider a woman who has been purchased and made wife, no better than a *dasi*.[92] We can also refer to the 'woman-slave or war-wife', known as *dhajaa-hataa*, 'brought with the flag' or *kara mara aanitaa*, 'brought under the threat of death.'[93]

viii) *Yakkha-dasi.* The mention of a slave *yakkhi* employed by Kubera, the king of the yakkhas, is found in the *Samanta-pasadika*.[94]

Common Terms

i) *Dasa kammakara.* Leaving aside the terms *dasi-dasa*[95] or *dasa-dasi*,[96] which denote the collectivity of slaves, let us take up the expressions which contain the two terms of slaves and servants together. Of such terms *dasa-kammakara*[97] is the shortest. The terms *dase ca kammakare ca*[98] or *daso va kammakaro va*[99] also denote slaves or servants. We find the same idea in the latter part of the term, *nati-parijana dasa-kammakara*.[100] Patanjali designates the same ensemble with the compound, *dasa-karmakara*.[101] In all these expressions, the servant is distinguished from the slave in as much as he receives a salary for work done by him.[102]

ii) *Dasa-pessa kammakara.* 'Slaves, *pessas* and servants.'[103] Ordinarily the word *pessa* is rendered as 'servant', but in this case, we have to differentiate the *pessas* from the *kammakaras*. This difficulty is resolved by the commentary as follows: The *pessas* receive their salary before the start of their work whereas

the *kammakaras* receive food and their wages (after their work is over?)[104]

We may note that the *Tipitaka* does not confirm this distinction and it tends to mix up the *pessa* with the servant. We should also take note of the expressions *dasa-pessa jana* and *dasa-kammakara-pessa*.[105] In another place the word *pessa* denotes a messenger, 'one who can be sent on a mission' and in this context even a slave can be a *pessa*.

iii) *Dasa-kammakara-porisa*. We have already explained the sense of the first two words in this compound, the third and last is *porisa* or *purisa*.[106] Ordinarily this word denotes 'male'. In the compound referred to above, there has been a tendency to assimilate this last word with the first two, and to translate the full compound as 'slaves and servants'. But according to Buddhaghosa, the word *porisa* (*purisa*) has a special sense and denotes 'persons' living under the protection of a family.[107] This refers to poor people who, because of lack of independent means of living, find support in some rich family. They are neither slaves nor servants although, out of a feeling of gratitude, they take up some work in the house of their protector. This is what is meant by the phrase, *nissaaya jivamaana-purisaanam ca*, 'men living by depending on someone else.'[108]

4. THE PRICES OF SLAVES

Although the *Tipitaka* recognises a type of purchased slaves, we have already seen that their examples are not very numerous. Those are the only cases. The reason for the relative insufficiency of data on this category is probably to be found in the interdiction of the commerce in slaves ordained by the Buddha. The Buddha did not want his lay devotees to undertake the commerce in human beings.[109] Hence, it is not surprising that the editors of this literature have avoided all references to this trade. In fact this censorship has been systematically applied and there are only a few references to the five categories of commerce prohibited by the Buddha. We may here note that the *Dharmasutras* also do not allow this trade to the Brahmins. They are forbidden to deal in human beings even in case of 'dire necessity'. It need not, however, be said that others could also not

carry on this trade.[110] Here we will try to set out the little information that is available in these texts.

According to the Pali literature, slaves, both men and women, could be purchased for a hundred pieces of money.[111] This was not, however, the only price and must have been one of the many, because the market was not under control and besides accidental elements such as the consequences of war, other factors like age, health, sex, etc. of the persons offered for sale could also affect the price level. Hence it will not be safe to accept the price of a hundred pieces of money as the *only* price current at that time.[112] Elsewhere a price of seven hundred pieces of money is mentioned but the context does not specify the number of slaves. If we accept the average price per slave to be a hundred pieces of money, then this sum must have sufficed for the purchase of seven slaves. But in the absence of precise information, there is no reason for linking up this sum with a definite number of slaves.[113] Of course nothing could prevent a rich person from paying any price 'he liked or even, double the due price' for any slave, man, woman or child, fancied by him or her.[114]

Buddhaghosa gives us the sum of fifty or sixty pieces of money as the price of a slave.[115] This can be a later quotation (contemporary of Buddhaghosa himself); if not so, then here is a third example. (We may note that the price of a donkey, 'very good at work', was eight *kahapanas*.[116]) Here we may observe that the price of manumission fixed for two princes, thousand *nikkhas* for a boy and a price amounting to seven hundred in various objects for a girl, seems to be an imaginary price.[117]

5. APPEARANCE AND DRESS

We do not find any difference in physical features between freemen and slaves. Even if there has been a line of demarcation between the two and whose traces can be found in the *Rig-veda* (see Chapter II), it is certain that in the time of the Buddha this distinction had disappeared. Certain types of slaves, such as those who ran away and were caught, were branded with red-hot iron. This is evidenced in the fear entertained by the slave Katahaka and the experience of the slave Kalanduka,

Kalanduka was caught and was branded with a red-hot iron.[118] In the *Samanta-pasadika*, there is a mention of a freed man who had been marked with a red-hot iron.[119] Even a woman who had lost her liberty could be so branded.[120]

Regarding such bodily marks, it is, however, not correct to say that the slaves had their heads shaved except for a pig-tail,[121] because in the story it is a question of *cetakas* and not of slaves.[122] Moreover, in this particular context, the *cetakas* and the *dasas* are juxtaposed although elsewhere the *dasas* are called *cetakas*.

Dress. Most probably the dress of the slaves did not differ from that of the poor freemen; both these two groups were badly clothed. Some idea of their dress and appearance can be had in this description of a poor peasant. 'The hair on the front thrown back, that of the back thrown forward, that of the left thrown to the right and that of the right thrown to the left.'[123] In another text we come across a man who earned his living by working for others and had only a piece of cotton-cloth to cover his loins. Another person, to pass for a poor man, dressed himself in a *pilotikaa*.[124] Further we read about a rich man, who being superstitious, does not wish to give his rat-eaten *dhoti* to his slave-servants, lest, instead of throwing it away, they should keep it and thus bring him harm. In the story of the Ajivika-sect leader, Makhhali Gosaala, Buddhaghosa[125] says that Gosaala was of servile origin, and refers to an edge of his robe as *dasa-kanna*. Does it signify the edge of the slave's robe? On the other hand, surprise at seeing a rich man, clad only in one garment (*ayyo eka-saatako!*) or clad in a garment of rough texture leads us to infer that the common people were so dressed.[126] The slaves and servants of a palace were probably better dressed if we are to judge from the story where such a woman servant changed into dirty *sari* to be able to pass off as a very poor person.[127] In another story, on learning that she was no longer required to do 'menial jobs', a woman-slave of a queen requested her mistress to order a bath for her and to give her a new *sari*.[128] Similarly Sujata, pleased with her woman-slave, gave her all the ornaments fit to be worn by a rich man's daughter.[129]

The slave-servants who worked in a kitchen were very badly clothed. In a story, we are told of a prince who worked in a royal kitchen in disguise. His body was full of dust as he used

to sleep on the bare (*kuccha*) floor and seldom had an opportunity of being served by a barber.[130] In another story we learn that the mistress of a rich household, desirous of herself preparing food for the monks, descended into the kitchen and immediately became unrecognisable. She was 'full of sweat and was covered with ashes'.[131] We may also describe here the dress of a rich man's daughter; desirous of eloping with a family-slave, she put on a piece of dirty cotton cloth, disarranged her hair and put some rice-powder on her body. Then she looked like a slave girl who husked rice in the family. Taking a water-pot and joining the women-slaves going to fetch water for the family, she was able to cross the family door and elope with her lover. Of course, there was no question of these people having ornaments, etc., as is clear from the statement of an *aramika*, a monastery-slave, who tells his child that poor people like them could not have necklaces and other ornaments.[132]

6. FOOD

As regards food, the information is clear and precise. Ordinarily the *dasa-kammakaras* received porridge of broken rice with sour gruel, known as *kanaajakam bilangu-dutiyakam*.[133] In the commentary on the *Digha-nikaya*, these two terms are explained as *sakandakam uttandula-bhattam* and *kanjika-dutiyam*.[134] Elsewhere[135] it is said that ordinarily householders serve this food to their slaves and other serving-folk but in that particular household even they used to receive a dish of perfumed rice cooked with meat. It goes without saying that food left over from the meals of the masters used to be served to the domestic slaves and servants. This idea is discernible in the *Mahabharata*,[136] where Damayanti, obliged to serve as maid, stipulates that she will not accept the remains of the master's food. The same was the experience of Draupadi, who had to seek a job in the palace of Virata. Something very near the type of cheap food mentioned above is obviously meant where a greedy and miserly Setthi is said to have lived by taking a meal of husk powder cake with sour rice-gruel.[137] In another story we learn that this *kanaajaka-bhatta* comes third in a hierarchy where the first two places are occupied by *ranno pakkabhattam ca annam ca*

(well-cooked rice and other food for the king) and *missaka-bhattam* (mixed food) respectively.[138] This rice-husk seems to have been much in use in so far as the poorer people were concerned, as in another context,[139] we learn about a poor wage-earner who, desirous of offering food to the Buddha, could obtain nothing better than a 'cake' of red powder of smooth rice-husk, wetted in water and baked in hot ashes. In a later text, we are told that *kumuda-bhandikaa*, explained as 'a kind of corn' (*PED*), served as food for slaves and servants.[140] This food is to be contrasted with 'fish, meat, wine, cooked rice, other eatables' which people of rich families used to eat.[141]

Obviously this nourishment was no good[142] and it is only natural that the *dasa-kammakaras* were prompted to undertake a difficult job if fed on a meal of good rice.[143] They could have such good food also when there was some rejoicing in the house or when their masters went out on a picnic. There they could also partake of wine and cooked rice (*suraa-bhattam*), normally *a-mulakam*, 'priceless' (i.e., beyond the reach of their pockets) for them.[144] But we do not know if the three *modake*, 'sweet cakes', offered by a *kula-dasi* were received by her on a like occasion. In general, a note of contempt is shown towards this food, by the use of the phrase, *dasa-paribhoga*, denoting slaves' fare.[145] The best summing up, we think, of the diet available to the various groups of people is given by Vidura who says that the rich have plenty of meat, the middle ones have plenty of milk products and the poor have oil (or salt) as the best thing in their food.[146]

7. SLAVE-NAMES

The slaves are generally called only *dasa* or *dasi* and it is very rare to come across one with a proper name. The names gathered by us, therefore, are not many. Hereunder are given some of the names of man-slaves.

Bijaka (j.VI.235)
Channa (Thg.68)
Daasaka (Thg.17)
Jaali (j.VI.546) — a prince given into slavery by his father.

Kaaka (vin.i.276)
Kalanduka (j.i.458)
Kanha (D.III.16)
Katahaka (j.i.451)

Makkhali Gosaala[147] (Ajivika-sect leader) (D.I,.47, D-a.I. 143-4)
Nanda (i.III.412)
Punna(ka) (vin.1.240, Bur. III 130. Mlp., IV-VIII.25)
Purana Kassapa[147a] (a heretic monk) (D.I.47. D-a.I.142.)
Vidura (j.VI.258)
Vidudabha (j.IV.145) (became king).

It may be noted that some free-men also had similar names. Nanda, for example, was the name of a cousin of the Buddha himself. On the other hand, the practice of adding the word *dasa* to a proper name, to show humility, is attested by the name of a free man—Giridasa (Thg.a.72). The same may be said of Mahidaasa Aitareya, who composed *Brahmanas* and *Aranyakas* by the grace of the Goddess of Earth. We are told that he was the son of a Brahmin seer by Itaraa, a *dasi*.[148]

In a *Vinaya*-passage (IV. 8, Hor., II. 274) the monks have been prohibited from abusing anyone by using any of the five names given below. The commentary explains that these names being the names of slaves, are bad ones. They are: Avakannaka, Javakannaka, Dhanitthaka, Savitthaka and Kulavaddhaka.

It is probably because of this taboo that nowhere in the *Tipitaka* do we come across a person who had a similar name. We have, however, noticed that some free men had names which, if not similar, were nearly identical to some of these names. There was a merchant, Kula Vaddhana, and a prince, Dhanittha.[149]

We give hereunder a list of proper names of woman-slaves:

Birani (j.V.117)
Disaa (D. III. 16)
Dhanapaali (j.i.402)
Kali (Dh-a.1.170)
Kanhaajinaa—a princess given into slavery by her father, Vessantara (j.VI.546)
Khujuttaraa (Bur.i.281)
Musikaa (j.III.216)
Naagamundaa (j.III.145)
Pingalaa (j.III.101)
Punnaa (j.i.68, II.428. Mlp. IV.37)
Rohini (j.i.248)
Punnikaa (Thig-a.65)
Rajjumaalaa (Vv-a.50)
Vaasabhakhattiyaa, (j.III.145)
Uttamaa Ti modaki (Thig-a.30)

As is the case with the names of men-slaves, many free women also had similar names. For example, Rohini was the name of the cousin-sister of the Buddha himself. Again, as in the case of men, the use of the word *dasi* at the end of a woman's name may denote humility.[150]

8. TERMS OF ADDRESS

i) *Slave to his master.* The slaves and the servants called their masters, *ariya, ayya* or *ajja* (*ayyaa* or *ajjaa* in the plural).[151] They also called them *ayyaputta*. This word signifies 'son of the master',[152] or simply 'the master',[153] and is used by the servants.[154] *Sami* and *deva* are other words used by the serving folk.[155]

ii) *Master to slaves and servants.* They had the same words for calling either the slaves or the servants, the one most frequently used being, *bhane*.[156] This word, derived from the root *bhan* is the vocative used for calling persons of inferior status. This is confirmed by a passage in the *Vinaya*, where a merchant calls his equal, *ayyaa* and his servants, *bhane*.[157] It may be noted that the use of the word *bho* in this sense is not very prevalent.[158]

Once in a while the vocative *are* is added to the name of the person addressed.[159] A master, known for his rudeness, would simply say *tvam*, whereas a master, who was polite, such as a Bodhisatta, would call his slave-servant *taata*.[160] In case of need, a master could invent some relationship with his slave and call him *maatula*, maternal uncle'.[161] Read in this context, it is easier to appreciate the feeling of contempt that the Buddha was able to create in the minds of the co-students of Ambattha, by telling them of the slave origin of the latter. All the esteem they had evinced for him till then, disappeared in no time and they started objecting even to the manner in which Ambattha had 'dared approach the Buddha,' 'had addressed the Buddha', who belonged to the tribe which gave the slave-ancestor to the family of Ambattha.[162]

As regards woman-slaves, they were addressed with the vocative *je*. This word is almost exclusively employed for them.[163] According to the commentary the use of this word was, however, current only in one region. Elsewhere the vocatives *hambho* or *amma* were used.[164] There are also cases where a master calls his serving folk simply by their proper names, such as the king who gave instructions to his woman-slave, Musikaa,[165] or when they used nothing as a vocative, as in the story where

the mistress of the house asked her young serving girl, *kuhim gacchasi?* (where are you going?',[166]

9. MANUMISSION

Cases

When a master frees his slave, it is said, 'he made his slave *bhujissa*'. In a story describing the manumission of two boys, it is said (the younger one) 'having made them *bhujissas*'.[165] In another place, we are told of the 500 women of a king's harem, who are made slaves of one of their co-wives. When their mistress frees them, it is said, 'They were made *bhujissaas*.'[168] The nun Punnaa or Punnikaa was also a slave. Her master made her a *bhujissaa* so that having attained the status of *bhujissaa,* freed woman, she could take to the life of religion.[169] Elsewhere a mistress tells her woman-slave, 'If what you say be correct, I will make you *a-dasi* (non-slave).'[170]

As regards the mode of manumission, we are told that a master desirous of freeing a slave, would wash his head and would declare him to be a *bhujissa*, a free man.[171]

Reasons

There are only a few cases of manumission in the *Tipitaka*. It is, therefore, difficult to undertake a detailed examination of the cases leading to the manumission of slaves. We can only describe the cases that we have noticed. At the time of becoming monk, Pipphali Maanava authorises his slaves to 'wash their heads themselves and consider themselves free.'[172] There is also the master who, full of faith, happily frees one of his men-slaves, so that the latter could become a monk.[173] In the case of the manumission of the two boy-slaves referred to above, the act was only a subterfuge as their master wanted them to serve his elder brother, who though blind, had become a monk and could no longer be looked after at home. On all such occasions, the manumission has been due to the desire of the master, acting on his own. On the other hand we read about a king who was obliged not only to manumit his slave but also to give him his

daughter as wife.[174] The manumission of Maddi, wife of Vessantara, when given away by the latter, was due to the generosity of Sakka, the god who had only tried to ascertain the sincerity of Vessantara. As the recipient of the two children of Vessantara was an earthly Brahmin (and not the god Sakka disguised as one), the poor children had to trudge their way right up to the kingdom of their grandfather for being manumitted. Elsewhere Buddhaghosa informs us that a slave could buy back his liberty by raising money from among his relations and friends.[175] In a later text, the parallel of the Sanskrit verb, *nish-kri*, to buy back, is used to denote the act of buying back the liberty of enslaved persons, the actual word being *nikkinissati* (in future).[175]

10. SLAVERY IN THE BUDDHIST MONASTERIES

Before concluding this chapter we propose to examine here the question of slavery in the Buddhist monasteries, for these were established only in this epoch.

On reading the modern works concerning the Buddhist order in India one gains the impression that no slave labour was employed in the monasteries. One would be inclined to believe that all the work, even in the big monasteries, like that of Kosambi or Rajagaha, was carried out by the monks themselves. However, a study of Pali literature shows clearly that the situation was otherwise.

It is well known that the Buddha had forbidden his monks to accept slaves in the Order. Slaves could be admitted only if they had already been. freed.[177] In most studies this interdiction is interpreted as a general rule to which there could be no exception. If any cases of slavery in the monasteries existed, in these studies they are either ignored or, contrary to reality, interpreted so as to conform to this opinion. N. Dutt, for example, never mentions slave labour in the monasteries.[178] It is difficult to find the word 'slave' in his book, for he goes to the extent of translating the composite word *dasa-kammakara* as 'servants and workers'[179] and the words *dasa* and *dasi* as 'male and female servants.' R. K. Mookerji is, on his part, more categorical. For him 'there is no proof that the Order possessed as property, slaves, horses'....[180]

However, in our opinion, there is no contradiction between the employment of slaves for the upkeep of the monasteries and the prohibition of accepting slaves, who have not been freed, as monks into the Order. But it can only be explained if the two aspects of the question are separated and examined in succession. There is no doubt as for the rule against the ordaining of slaves as monks. This rule was absolute and no exception to it can be found. But to come to a decision regarding the employment of slaves it is necessary to trace the evolution of the Order and of its material needs. In the beginning the question of the employment of slaves did not arise as only individuals renounced the world and followed the Buddha in his travels. There were also a few groups of ascetics (the Jatila brothers for example) who had agreed to follow the Buddha as master, but they had already decided upon their way of living and the problem of material organisation did not exist for them. Soon, however, the number of disciples could be counted in hundreds. It was no longer possible that all these people followed the Master and the need arose to settle down somewhere, to have monastic residences. Of course, tradition demanded that the monks travelled for at least eight months in the year, but for the remaining four months they had to lead a sedentary life. They were authorised to pass this period wherever it seemed convenient to them for their spiritual salvation. We may also remark that the rule (according to the Brahmin tradition) against an ascetic spending more than three days in a town and more than a day in a village[181] is not mentioned in the *Vinaya*. Besides, the Buddhist monks were not expected to live in absolute isolation from each other. (Yajnavalkya, III-58, ordains that an ascetic must live alone.) Community living, and residing at one place for at least four months, must have, therefore, posed new problems for them. It is only in the light of these prefatory remarks that we can understand the gifts of parks and buildings made to the Order, and which were gratefully accepted.

The Aramika

On the other hand, we must not forget that the Buddha, anxious to free his monks of material preoccupations, had forbidden almost all manual labour to them.[182] Left to themselves,

the monks could only build small huts for their lodgings. This was sufficient for a monk living alone, but for a group of monks this posed a difficult problem. It was at this time that some donors began to get monasteries built.[183] As all manual labour was forbidden to the monks, it was but natural that one looked outside the monasteries for the labour necessary for the upkeep of these buildings. A story from *Vinaya* gives us a glimpse into the origins of the acceptance of such labour. According to this story, the monk Pipphali Maanava was supervising the work of levelling the soil when he was noticed by a prince. The prince offered some *aramikas* for the work but the monk would not say anything without obtaining the permission of the Buddha. It was in this manner that the prince was able to make a gift of five hundred *aramikas*, who settled down with their families in a village near the monastery and began to work for their new masters.[184] The context shows that there was a gift of five hundred men and we are inclined to believe that these were slaves and not free men. In a later text,[185] the editor includes the *aramikas* as also mats, utensils, medicines, etc. among gifts made to a monastery. As to the name *aramika*, it is very likely that the monastic world borrowed this word from the common vocabulary: rich people possessed pleasure houses, *aramas* outside the town and the men responsible for the upkeep of these houses and their gardens, etc., were called *aramikas*.[185-a] The word itself reveals the nature of the work done. (It seems that very soon the problem of supervising the work of the *aramikas* must have arisen, for, it is said, they did not work very well without supervision. It was, therefore, decided to elect a monk, called *aramika-pessaka*, to supervise the work of the *aramikas*.[186])

Another aspect of the problem is brought to light by the case of a man who renounced the world and became a monk but continued to be served by his slaves whom he would call from his home.[187] This shows that the renunciation of the world did not automatically lead to the emancipation of the slaves. A master's renunciation of the world did not destroy his legal rights over his slaves. On the other hand it is likely that the refusal to accept slaves into the Order only applied to those slaves who wished to become monks without the permission of their master. Against this, the Order had found a means of accepting slaves to do the

work connected with a monastery: slaves could be accepted if they came as a pious gift from the master. The story of the monk Daasaka, who was a rich man's slave and was given the work of a door-keeper in a monastery, provides an example. Daasaka worked at the gates of the monastery and later, having obtained his master's consent, became a monk.[188] Till his emancipation, on the eve of becoming a monk, he was only a slave in the service of the monastery. This is confirmed by Buddhaghosa: 'The kings have given *aramikas* to the monasteries. They must not be converted unless they have been freed.'[189]

The Kappiya-karaka

Beside the term *aramika* we also find the term *kappiya-karaka*, 'one who makes arrangements', 'one who arranges (things)', which designates men who have not become monks but who are charged with the execution of certain jobs forbidden to the monks but necessary nevertheless. In the *Vinaya*,[190] when it is a question of accepting an *aramika*, since the Buddha has permitted it, mention is also made of accepting a *kappiya-karaka*. Although facts, similar to those concerning the acceptance of *aramikas*, are not cited in respect of the *kappiya-karakas*, their status seems to have been similar to that of the *aramikas*, for it is said, 'They cannot be accepted if offered as slaves, but may be accepted if offered as *aramikas* or as *kappiya-karakas*.' The silence of the *Vinaya* on the origin of the acceptance of the *kappiya-karakas*, although disturbing, does not bar our way to understanding the circumstances which might have given birth to this institution. Let us begin again by considering the rule against accepting slaves. For people in good health this did not create much difficulty. But what about the people who suffered from some infirmity? Such a situation was present when a blind man became a monk. His younger brother wished to offer two boy-slaves. But the blind monk refused to accept them in view of the interdiction. The younger brother simply freed the two slaves, had them ordained as monks and ordered them to look after their new master, the blind monk.[191] In this case the two boys were no longer slaves, but the intention of their master was clear. He had freed them in order that they continue to serve another person. Similar situations must have played a

role in the creation of the institution of *kappiya-karaka* inside the Order. Here it is a question of a person placing himself in the service of a monk. From this point of view, his connection with the Order was through a monk, (in contrast with the *aramika*, who was in the service of the monastery).[192] We may point out some appropriate remarks made by Buddhaghosa on this subject. 'The *upaasakas,* wishing to increase their merit, order some of their employees to serve the monks.'[193]

Historical Examples

The existence of these slaves is confirmed by tradition. The Chinese pilgrim, Yi-tsing, saw them in a monastery. He speaks of the lands, houses, slaves, etc. left by a *bhikkhu* and later adds: 'Certain property, like slaves of two sexes, cattle, lands and houses' are included in the *garubhanda* and became the property of the 'community of the four regions.'[194] The *garubhanda* constitutes the 'weighty equipment.' Fa-hsien also mentions the existence in Madhyadesha of 'lands, houses, gardens, families of people, cattle' gifted to the Samgha by kings and householders. Such gifts are recorded on metal plates and are honoured by the latter-day kings.[195]

The fact that the monasteries had the right to accept slaves is also proved by the writings of another pilgrim, Huee-Chi'ao, a Korean, who visited India in the first quarter of the 8th century. Speaking of the Turkish king of Gandhara, he describes how this fervent Buddhist used to make a gift of his wealth and his wives to the monks and then buy them back.[196] There are numerous references to prove the existence of slaves in the Buddhist monasteries in China. Thus a *sutra* of the T'ang dynasty bewails the regime in which goods belonging to the Samgha, including the 'slaves owned by the "Three Jewels" (*triratna*) are used by the administration.'[197] Elsewhere[198] we learn that generally virgin lands and hilly tracts possessed by the monasteries were cultivated by their slaves whereas lands open to normal irrigation were worked by a certain type of serfs. These slaves were normally in charge of the maintenance of the monasteries but could also be sent to aid the peasants at the time of ploughing, harvesting, etc. Public slaves and criminals used to be formed into groups and known as the 'families of the Buddha.'

According to Gernet, other means of obtaining slaves were purchase and slave-raising.[199]

The situation was similar in Ceylon, where one always tried to conform to the Pali texts.[200] According to an incident cited by Buddhaghosa, the families of the *aramikas* working for the monastery of Chitta-lataa Parvata (in Ceylon) could very well have been employed since many generations.[201] Elaborating the rules regarding the use of *aramikas*, Buddhaghosa foresees the situation when due to lack of work in the monasteries they could go and work elsewhere. In such a case he recommends that the wages handed over by them be accepted.

As to the nuns, no examples of the acceptance of slaves by the convents are to be found in Pali texts. Was there a complete interdiction to accept slaves in the case of convents?

CHAPTER VI

KAUTALYA ON SLAVERY

To begin with we give hereunder the translation of Chapter III-13, entitled *'Dasa-Kalpah'*, 'Dispositions Concerning Slaves'. We have decided to give this translation, as the only translation available in English is not reliable. Since most of our arguments are based on a correct understanding of the original text, it has been found necessary to include the same in this volume as Appendix V. We would also like to remark that by placing these rules governing the conduct of slaves in the chapter concerning legal matters (Bk. III), Kautalya has clearly recognised the legitimacy of the institution of slavery, though he puts many limitations on its practice.

1. RULES GOVERNING THE CONDUCT OF SLAVES

'A fine of 12 *panas* is to be imposed on the relation who takes a minor Shudra, Arya[a] by birth for sale or for mortgage, except when the person concerned is a "slave of stomach" (*udara-dasa*[b]). In the case of a Vaishya the amount of the fine is multi-

[a] According to Patanjali (commenting on Panini, *aryanam anirvasitanam*. II.4.10), a Shudra is an Arya, if he lives within the boundary of the village.

[b] The word *udara-dasa* significe 'slave of stomach' and indicates a person who accepts to be the slave of someone in return for nourishment. In this chapter we come across nine types of slaves, viz., *udara-dasa*, *danda-pranita*, *dhvajaa-hrita*, *grihe-jaata*, *daaya-aagata*, *labdha*, *krita*, *aatma-vikrayi* and *aahitaka*. In comparison with the list of the *Tipitaka* (see Ch. v) which contains only four types of slaves, this one is longer. Nevertheless the four types of the *Tipitaka*, are also found here. This is the case with *antojaata*, 'born at home', *'dhanak-kita'*, 'purchased with money' and *'kara-mara-aanita'*, 'slave of war', here known respectively as *grihe-jaata*, *krita* and *dhvajaa-hrita*. One can equally put *aatma-vikrayi* against the *krita*. The voluntary slave of the *Tipitaka* (*saamam daasavvam upaagata*) can be compared with the *udaradasa* of Kautalya. Kautalya, however, also provides for the same type of voluntary slave (III. 13-47.) when he refers to persons who have been rescued from a river-current, from fire, from thieves and from dangerous animals on offering their sons, wives and themselves to the rescuer. From

plied by two, in that of a Kshatriya by three and in that of a Brahmin by four. If, however, the culprit is not a relation, the punishment is to be respectively the first, the second, the third amercements,[c] and the death penalty. The buyers and the witnesses will also be liable to these punishments. The Mlecchas may sell or mortgage their children,[d] [but] an Arya cannot be reduced to slavery.[e] [It is, however, permissible] to mortgage an Arya for saving the family from imprisonment or the Aryas in danger. [In any case] having obtained the release money [the relatives] must, first of all, buy back the liberty of the child or of the person who has aided [or who is capable of aiding] the family.

this point of view, the list of Kautalya may be considered later to that of the *Tipitaka*. (Although examples of the remaining types can be found in the *Tipitaka*, their names are not found in the list).

[c] These are fixed respectively at 250, 500 and 1000 *panas*. (See Konow, *Kautalya Studies*, p. 44).

[d] This first section deals with the sale and mortgage of persons—men, women and children. It is, therefore, a description of slavery with a limited period. First of all Kautalya establishes a distinction between two types of persons according as they belong to one of the four *varnas* (*a*) Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras or not. He considers these four to be Aryas and the rest as Mlecchas. He prescribes no restrictions regarding the sale or mortgage of the children of the Mlecchas and declares that the Mlecchas can sell or mortgage their children. On the contrary he imposes restrictions on the sale and mortgage of persons belonging to the Arya group; except for the *udara-dasa*, he prohibits the sale and mortgage of minors. This implies that the sale or mortgage of persons belonging to the Arya group is authorised, provided that the person to be sold or mortgaged is not a minor. A minor belonging to the Arya group can be so treated if he is an *udara-dasa*. We have already referred to the power of the father to dispose of his children as and when he found it necessary (see under 'Judicial Punishment'). This provision of Kautalya seems to restrict that power. On the other hand, references even in later literature, to this power are available as in the *Milinda-panho* (iv. viii-6), where it is said that a father has the right to mortgage or sell his son to earn his living or when under debt.

Commenting on a passage of the *Vinaya*, Buddhaghosa differentiates between a person mortgaged by his parents or grand-parents or by himself against some loan and a person mortgaged by other relations. According to the rules of the Buddhist Order prevailing (at least in his time), a monk committed a crime (vis-a-vis the Order) only if he ordained the former without the permission of the creditor concerned. (sp., p. 999). At another place the same author tells us of persons mortgaged by mother or father for a sum of fifty or sixty coins (sp. s, II-361).

[e] This phrase must be read in close conjunction with the preceding one, saying that the Mlecchas have the right to sell or mortgage their children. On the other hand, the author does not wish to accord

'The person who mortgages himself will remain a slave [for ever] if he runs away [and is caught]. One who has been mortgaged by another, will become a slave for ever if he escapes twice [and is caught]. But both of them will become slaves for ever, if they run towards a foreign country. Half of the amercement [described above] will be imposed on a person who deprives of *arya-bhaava* [state of freedom], a person reduced to slavery for a temporary period but who has stolen money.[f]

'The mortgagee gets the price of persons who run away, who die or who suffer from incurable diseases.

'[But] the creditor loses his money if he makes the mortgaged person carry a dead body, garbage, urine or leavings of food. Similar is the case of mortgaged women if [in addition to cases enumerated above, they are made to] bathe a naked man, or if they are beaten or violated.[g] [Moreover] the wet-nurse, the maid-servant [*parichaarikaa*], the wife of the tenant and the *upachaarikaa* [if so treated] are also liable to be released [their price being lost].[h] A person of noble birth [if mortgaged] has the right of running away, if he is made to do the work of an *upachaaraka*.

---

the same liberty to persons of the Arya-group even when they are Shudras. As a consequence he decrees: 'An Arya cannot be reduced to slavery' (like a Mleccha sold or mortgaged by his relations). This signifies that an Arya does not have the right to sell or mortgage his children. This is confirmed by the succeeding sentence, which foresees precisely the circumstances under which this prohibition becomes ineffective and which authorises the sale or mortgage of the persons belonging to the Arya-group. According to a passage in the *Anguttara Nikaya* (XIX), Mlecchas (*Milakkhas* in Pali) are ignorant people born in the frontier regions.

[f] We read this sentence along with the preceding ones, which prescribe, for a mortgaged person, the loss of his right to release, if he tries to run away. This is the punishment for him, because his attempt, if successful, will result in a total loss of the investment of the creditor. By this clause Kautalya implies a distinction between the loss caused to the creditor on account of the evasion of the mortgaged person and the loss (by theft and damage) which a mortgaged person may cause to his creditor. This second act does not affect in any way his legal status, i.e. his right to release on payment of release-money.

[g] This sentence prohibits the employment of mortgaged persons including women on certain jobs.

[h] This clause divides mortgaged women into various categories and accords several of them increased protection. The *Dharma-sutras* also foresee the mortgage of women and prescribe that even after a woman has passed a period of 10 years under mortgage, she can be freed on payment of release-money (*Gautama*, XII-39). (For *dhatri* and *parichaarikaa* see also supra, p. 47) Here we may also read with

'The first amercement will be inflicted on a person who violates a mortgaged wet-nurse living under his protection, the second [if the mortgaged nurse is] under the protection of another. [The creditor accused] of having violated a mortgaged virgin or of having her violated by another, loses his money and [must pay] the price of marriage and twice this amount as fine.[i]

'The children of a person who has mortgaged himself remain Aryas.[j] Such a person [who has mortgaged himself] receives all that he has earned without prejudice to the work of his master [i.e., by working in his free time], as also the heritage of his parents. He obtains his *arya-bhaava* [when he] pays the price [release-money]. This [also] describes the "slave of stomach" and the mortgage.[k]

'The amount of release money is equal to the money obtained against mortgage.[l]

'Whosoever is reduced to slavery as a result of judicial decision [for not having been able to pay a fine] will pay the fine by work.[m]

profit the regulation in the ancient law of Thailand (where the law-books have for their base the local custom, the *Manusmriti* and the *Vinaya*), whereby a remission of half the period of mortgage is accorded to a woman, compelled to have sexual relations with the creditor or anyone of his choice. No such protection is accorded to women sold into slavery (R. Lingat, *L'Esclavage privé dans le vieux droit siamois*, p. 234).

[i] A virgin, if mortgaged, enjoys still greater protection. In case of violation, not only does the creditor lose his money, he is also made to pay the money for the marriage of such a girl. Besides, he is liable to fine, the amount thereof being two times the marriage-money.

[j] An Arya who sells himself, loses only his own liberty, his children remain free. The next clause gives such a person the right to inherit from his relations and of keeping all that he has earned without prejudice to the interests of his master.

[k] All these clauses (up to the end of this sentence) apply equally to one who has accepted slavery because of hunger and one who has been mortgaged. The legal status of their relations cannot be affected by their loss of freedom; they also do not lose neither the right of inheritance nor that of keeping the money earned without prejudice to the interests of their masters. Their slavery ends when they offer the release-money.

[l] Here ends the section dealing with the *udara-dasas*, the persons sold or mortgaged.

[m] This concerns slavery imposed by a judicial decision, but whose term is fixed, because the convicted person can become free, after having served his sentence.

'An Arya "carried with the flag" [slave of war] can be released either in consideration of the period spent by him in the service [of his captor] or for half his price.

'The first amercement will be inflicted on a master who forces a slave, less than eight years old, without relations and born at home or inherited or gained or purchased, to do manual work against his will or takes him to a foreign country with a view to sale or mortgage. The same punishment for the master who takes a pregnant woman-slave for sale or mortgage without making any arrangements for her delivery. [In such cases] the purchasers and the witnesses [are also liable to the same punishment].[11]

'A fine of 12 *panas* and imprisonment [is the punishment] for a person who does not restore the *arya-bhaava*[12] of a slave [on presentation of the] due release-money. The relatives have the right of inheriting the goods belonging to a slave. In the absence of relatives [these goods become the property] of the master.

'The son born of a woman slave and her master will be considered free as also that woman slave.[13] If this woman, desirous of looking after the family, stays at home, her mother, her brother and her sister will be manumitted.

'Twelve *panas* is the fine for the person who takes an already

---

[11] These four categories of slaves are considered as slaves for life. Yet, by the above-mentioned clause, the author states the circumstances under which a slave, even if belonging to one of these categories, can enjoy some protection. Such a slave, if below 8 years and without relations, cannot be put on to certain dirty jobs against his will, nor can he be taken to a foreign territory for sale or mortgage. A pregnant woman-slave, belonging to one of these categories, cannot be taken to a foreign country for sale or mortgage if no arrangements have been made for her delivery. Kautalya prescribes a punishment for the violation of this rule. In the light of this sentence, the compound, *dasi-bhaara*, 'maintenance [lit., 'weight'] of a woman-slave', which is found in Panini (VI-2-42) and from there in Patanjali, is interpreted by V. S. Agrawala (*op. cit.*, p. 79) as 'the duty of a master to maintain a pregnant woman-slave and of not selling her during this time.'

[12] Such a *dasa* on regaining his *arya-bhaava*, can be called an *arya-krita*, (*arya-kriti* in the case of women) according to Panini, iv, i-30, as explained by V. S. Agrawala, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

[13] This clause institutes a distinction between boys born of a woman-slave and her master and those born of a woman-slave and some one other than the master. According to Kautalya, if the master himself is the father of the boy, the boy as also his mother must be freed.

released slave, man or woman, for sale or mortgage, except in the case of slaves who do so voluntarily.[q]

Here ends the chapter regarding the rules on slavery. As we have already indicated above, these rules concern chiefly the slaves of certain definite categories, e.g., persons who have temporarily lost their liberty. There is nowhere else, in this text, any systematic treatment of slavery. There are, however, stray remarks, concerning slaves for life and those for a fixed period. We have collected these references (see Appendix VI for original) and arranged them under a number of headings supplied by us.

2. OTHER REMARKS RELATING TO SLAVERY

i) *Loss of Civil Liberty and its Consequences*

'(*a*) [A plaint] instituted by a slave or a mortgaged person shall not be entertained [in a court of law].

'(*b*) A spy out to harm, through death, a person suspected of disloyalty to the king, should provoke him by calling him a slave and his wife, his daughter-in-law and his daughter, a woman-slave or wife.[1]

'(*c*) A person who institutes a case against a dead person suffering from an incurable disease will make payment [in case of rejection of his case, to the heirs] and will work [as slave to the king].

'(*d*) The prisoners should be purified [through receiving punishment, i.e. released] every day or every fifth night on acceptance of gold or by inflicting physical punishment or by making them work [as slaves for a definite period].

'(*e*) A woman, accused of having herself pierced her maiden-head, becomes the slave of the king.

'(*f*) A man can enjoy, after agreement [as wife] a woman belonging to another, if he has saved her from enemy or from

[q] First of all, Kautalya prescribes the cases where the sale or mortgage of persons is authorised and which confer the right of master on the creditor. Thereafter he puts in important restrictions on the enjoyment of this right of property; the protection thus afforded to persons sold or mortgaged is balanced by rules regarding the transformation of such persons into slaves for life (under certain circumstances).

people living in a forest, or from a river, or when she had been abandoned in a forest, or during a famine, or when she has been left for dead. Such a woman [however] must be restored [to her people] on receipt of release-money. If she belongs to a higher caste [in comparison to the man who rescued her], or if she does not desire [to stay with him] or if she has children. [Then follow some verses]: A man can enjoy a woman, with her consent, if he has saved her from thieves, from the current of the river, from famine, from a revolution, from a forest, or when she has lost her way or when she has been abandoned as dead. But [no man can enjoy a woman] who has been abandoned by order of the king, or by her relatives or who belongs to a higher caste [in comparison to that of her rescuer] or who is not desirous [of living with him] or who has already had children. Such a woman will be restored on receipt of release-money.

'(*g*) [Among other objects] a woman cannot be lost [simply because of the length of the period for which she has been] put to use [by the creditor].[2]

'(*h*) [Persons or objects] brought from another territory by force [of arms] may be enjoyed after securing the permission of the king, except persons born free or goods belonging to gods [e.g. temples], Brahmins and ascetics.

'(*i*) [The officials in charge of the grain, the live-stock or gold, if malcontent] should be sent to mines, after their children and women have been placed under protection.

'(*j*) A person [convicted of the theft of minerals] as also one who extracts [the minerals] without licence, should be made to work as miners, after having been put in chains. The same for one who works to pay his fine.

'(*k*) The king will announce the crime of a Brahmin accused of having committed a *paapa* [sin], will have him marked with a sign [in red hot iron] and have him exiled or have him sent to the mines.'[3]

ii) *Protection against Abduction*

'(*a*) The second amercement of 200 to 500 [*panas*] [is the punishment] for [abducting] live-stock, men, etc.

'(*b*) The amputation of both the feet or [a fine of] six hundred [*panas*] for one who abducts a slave, man or woman.

'(*c*) The amputation of the left hand and of both the feet or [a fine of] nine hundred [*panas*] for abducting a virgin or a woman-slave with gold.

'(*d*) The highest amercement [i.e., the third] or capital punishment without torture for abducting a man.'

iii) *Protection to the Woman Slave*

'(*a*) The first amercement for one [convicted of] causing abortion to a slave-woman by means of drugs.

'(*b*) A fine of 24 *panas* to one violating the free-daughter of a slave, man or woman. He will also be made to pay the money and jewellery required for the marriage of such a girl. A fine of 12 *panas* and the payment of jewellery and clothes for violating a mortgaged woman-slave. One giving advice or opportunity is liable to the same punishment.

'(*c*) [A town-guardian] violating a woman-slave is liable to first amercement; if the woman is not a slave he is liable to the second amercement...; if she is already taken [by some one] as wife he is liable to the third amercement.... In case of a woman of noble birth [*kulastri*] he is liable to capital punishment.

'(*d*) A man violating, in the prison, a bought or mortgaged woman-slave, is liable to the first amercement.... [The superintendent or guardian violating] a woman-slave is liable to the first amercement.

'(*e*) [A free woman who has had sexual relations] of her own will with a slave, a servant or a mortgaged man, is liable to the amputation of the distinctive symbols of her sex [the breasts, etc.] and to capital punishment [as also the man concerned]'.

iv) *Slaves of the King*

'(*a*) Woman-slaves not belonging to the harem shall be prohibited from having contact with the harem.

'(*b*) The king, on getting up from his bed, shall be surrounded by women armed with bows and arrows.[4]

'(*c*) Women-slaves should do the work of assisting at the bath and at massage, of preparing the bed, of washing clothes

and of weaving garlands or these jobs should be done by artisans under their control.

'(*d*) The king should have cotton spun by women who acquit themselves of their sentence by work...by royal women-slaves become old and by the retired *Deva-dasis*.

'(*e*) Those women who do not go out of their houses but who work for supporting themselves should be given work through women-slaves belonging to himself [i.e. the King] and be shown regard due to them.

'(*f*) [In the royal granary] broken grains may be given to slaves, servants and to cooks preparing the soup....slaves and servants constitute the *vishti* [i.e. persons liable to do *begar*].

'(*g*) A prostitute-slave when past enjoyment should work in the store or kitchen... The highest amercement in case of assault on the "madam", the apprentice-prostitute [not yet installed in the profession] and the *rupa-dasi*.[5] [Persons engaged] in the instruction of prostitute-slaves [in various arts] shall be given maintenance by the king.

'(*h*) [In a wine-shop, bad wine] may be supplied to slaves and servants in [part] payment of their wages.[6]

'(*i*) [In a wine-shop] the merchants will know the sentiments of persons having the *arya-rupa*, whether strangers or residents, when they are asleep or drunk, by [employing] their pretty women-slaves.

'(*j*) Women-slaves may pass on secret messages [destined for the king].

'(*k*) On fields belonging to himself [the king], and *ploughed* by many ploughs, he will have the sowing done by slaves, servants and by those who work in lieu of some punishment.... A *pana* and a quarter per month plus cooked rice (*bhakta*) should be given to slaves and servants according to their share in sowing.'

v) *Slaves Belonging to Individuals*

'(*a*) [The king should know the number of] persons belonging to four *varnas*... servants and slaves [of each village].

'(*b*) Discipline will be enforced on slaves, on mortgaged persons and on relations [*bandhun*] if they do not hear [obey]

their head of the family [ie., do not obey him and work in the construction of a barrage].

'(c) Or the owner should own it and pay five *panas* as release-money for a biped [i.e. slave recovered by king's men].'

3. ANALYSIS OF KAUTALYA'S VIEWS

We have already seen that in comparison with the *Tipitaka*, the classification of slaves done by Kautalya is more detailed. In fact, instead of the four types of the former, this authority enumerates seven or nine categories.[7] Among these he takes up the case of the slave of war, defines the method of acquiring him and puts certain limitations on slave-raids. For him a person captured in a battle or raid (organised presumably with the king's knowledge) is deemed a slave of war and that only if he obtains the king's permission to keep him as such. This extension of the king's power can, possibly, be seen in relation to the progress achieved in the administrative organisation of the country.[8]

In certain cases, where the captured person enjoyed a high status in his country, the new master is told to accept release-money and let him go. In the *Tipitaka*, on the contrary, no such provisions exist. In addition to the inherited and purchased slaves, Kautalya discusses at length the case of slavery imposed as a result of a judicial decision. These details are, again, missing in the *Tipitaka*. The most interesting one is, perhaps, the provision for enslaving a person who institutes a false complaint against others (under certain circumstances). It is also clear that in certain other cases, people convicted of a number of crimes, could be reduced to slavery. Most of these are not described, but there is no doubt about the existence of this practice, inasmuch as Kautalya provides for the release of criminals from prison, if they have been purged of their crime by slave-labour.

A crime, which has, however, been clearly set down, related to the Brahmins who indulge in sinful deeds. Such Brahmins could be sent to mines for slave-labour. While such a crime was to be announced to the public, in another case, even this was not done and the decision to send the malcontents from among the king's officials to mines or other places of work for slave-

labour, must have been, purely, an executive decision. The families of such persons, it is added, were to be placed under 'protection'.

Among the voluntary slaves, it is worth while mentioning the case of persons rescued from some dangerous situation. The rescuer could, in such cases, claim ownership of such persons, but this is again subject to limitations. For men so rescued, high status, by birth or wealth, could be helpful, as they could obtain release on payment of suitable compensation. In the case of women so rescued, besides high status, other factors introduced are, her willingness, her already having children, etc. But no one could rescue a woman who had been left exposed to a dangerous situation by order of the king or by her own kinsmen. In such cases, it is to be presumed that succour was illicit.

Similarly a father could, in case of need, abandon or sell or mortgage his progeny. But in all such cases, the innovation in the Mauryan times is the acceptance, into the judicial code, of slavery for a short period, as contrasted with the times of the Buddha, where although such cases existed, no hint about its juridical nature can be discerned. In fact, in earlier times, there seems to have been no difference, as regards the master's power, between a slave for life (inherited, etc.) and one for a short period (mortgaged, etc.). But in Mauryan times, the master's power, especially over the mortgaged persons, is limited and very well defined and we can say that this limitation has led to a basic difference in the status of this type of slave.

Let us take up some of the particulars concerning the mortgaged persons. The first thing to notice is the distinction between slaves and relations which may have to be mortgaged. Kautalya lays down that a free person can, ordinarily speaking, be mortgaged only if he is above eight years in age and also in one's own country. Slaves could be mortgaged even in foreign lands but here also a slave below eight years of age cannot be taken to foreign land for sale or mortgage. Since the act of mortgage against loans (or any other service) is a use of one's capital, it is interesting that our author does not allow the owner to pledge or sell a slave after he has been redeemed. Such a redeemed slave can be re-mortgaged or re-sold only with his/her consent. This is a serious. limitation on the master's right.

With reference to the prohibition of mortgaging Aryas below eight years of age, the text lays down an exception when it says that in times of distress, even such children could be mortgaged. But since this is not allowed at all times, this assumes the form of a serious limitation on the father's power over his progeny, already referred to elsewhere.[9] Again, mortgaged persons could not be put to all sorts of work. This was doubly true of mortgaged women, who could not be assigned such jobs as that of assisting their naked master at the bath. Moreover, the master had to check his lustful intentions vis-a-vis such women (including wet-nurses, maidservants, wife of the share-cropper, etc.), because any attempt at co-habitation with them (against their will) would have led to an automatic forfeiture of the mortgage. The obvious inference is that the master could act according to his fancy only as far as his women-slaves were concerned.

Before taking up the question of the master's power vis-a-vis his slaves, however, let us note that the limitation of time, generally imposed on a mortgage, could not be observed in the case of women so pledged, (and certain other objects). Therefore, a debtor, who had pledged his wife or daughter or daughter-in-law or his woman-slave, could redeem such a mortgage even after the expiry of the period stipulated in the deed.

In the sphere of the master's power over his slave, the Mauryan times saw a radical change, as our text provides for the release from slavery of a *dasi* who gave birth to a son (in union with her master). Not only did she acquire this right to release, but her son so born also acquired the legal status of a son along with his other brothers, if any. This is new compared to the times of the Buddha, when even a king's son could be thrown back into slavery, along with his mother, if the latter had been born of a slave-mother.[10] Further, the slave-mother's right to liberty in such a case could be transferred to her relations, mother, brother, etc., if she preferred to stay on with her master. In order to buttress this privilege granted to a woman-slave, Kautalya provides for punishment to those who are accused of causing abortion to a pregnant woman-slave. The fine for selling or mortgaging a pregnant woman-slave, without any arrangement for her maternity, may also be read here. Perhaps the procreator had to guarantee not only adequate care for the pre-natal and

ante-natal periods but also had to provide for the child. We know what a son could claim in such a case but in view of the author's silence, we cannot say that a daughter, so born, could be the cause of the manumission of her mother. Perhaps she herself was entitled only to a decent wedding. But we cannot be sure.

Since a free person could sell or mortgage his own person also, it may be observed that the creditor in such cases no longer enjoyed absolute rights. Thus the progeny of a self-sold slave retained its *arya-bhaava*, freedom. Those who have based their interpretation of Kautalya's views on slavery on one of his sentences, namely, *na hi aryasya dasa-bhaavah*, and have understood it to mean that an Arya cannot be slave, would do well to read the implication of their interpretation with reference to this phrase. If no Arya could be slave, then only non-Aryas could be slaves and hence this phrase would imply that a non-Arya, by selling himself into slavery, would obtain the status of an Arya for his progeny. Moreover, a self sold person did not have to transfer all his rights to his master. Accordingly he retains his right to inherit from his relations (this being in opposition to the well-known maxim of the slave's property being his master's property.[11]) In opposition again to the concept of a slave being liable to serve his master at all times (it being implied that he can have no claims to the fruits of his labour), this author lays down some limitations on the master's right to exploit the slave day and night and says that anything earned by a slave, without prejudice to master's work, remains with the slave.

Punishment in the shape of fine is prescribed for a master who does not 'make Arya' a *dasa* who offers (or on whose behalf is offered) the right amount of compensation. This incidentally, points again to the Aryas becoming slaves, as otherwise, it would have to be assumed that a non-Arya become slave, would become Arya when manumitted!

The centralized administration of the times was to interest itself yet in another sphere touching the slave. This related to dam-building. Since the work was to be carried out by peasants free of charge, such peasants were to benefit later because of regular supplies of water for their fields, the state-officials could fix the number of men to be sent by each household and here the

rich could send, in their own stead, their slaves, servants, etc. Now if any one among the latter proved recalcitrant, it was the duty of the king's men to make him work. The importance of this provision becomes clear when we read that a head of family who had failed to contribute his quota of labour in barrage-building, rendered himself liable to a fine, in proportion to the man-hours which he was to contribute for the collective job.

We have already seen that during the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. the monarchical form of state consolidated itself in the Ganges valley, giving rise in the 4th century to its most-developed form of empire. This consolidation of a state came in at a time of all-round development, especially in the field of agriculture and commerce. Vast areas were cleared of forests and land thus opened up, was put under the plough.

Similarly, it was a period of the development of commerce. Since a centralised administration, not content with officials paid in land-grants, has to recruit a big army of people on money-salary basis, it has to collect money by all means open to it. That the Mauryan administration had a big staff of salaried officials can be seen from a glance at the table of contents of the *Artha-shastra*. It is, therefore, quite natural that the Mauryan state engaged itself in all sorts of money-making enterprises, ranging from agriculture to commerce. In fact, it did not turn its face away from even the so-called unproductive sources of money-making and mopped up surplus-money by running gambling houses, wine-shops, brothels, etc. While investment could not be heavy in the gambling-houses and must have been slight in the case of wine-shops (it seems that these were given on lease), the state seems to have invested considerable sums of money in brothels, as it had to train courtesans and build up an organisation to cope with this work. Here all that interests us is the status of the *ganikaa* in so far as it approaches that of a slave. True, in our selection of quotations we have omitted most of those dealing with the courtesan. This is because we have limited ourselves to a selection of references having a direct mention of the slaves. Nevertheless, it is clear that a girl, on whom the state invested a thousand pieces of money and who was then given training in fine arts at state-expense (her teachers being maintained by the state), was under the complete control of the state,

with regard to her earnings, her possessions, etc. The provision of 24 times the initial money spent on her, as her release-money, also seriously limited her liberty and brought her near a slave, though she could not be put to all sorts of work. Moreover, unlike the slave, she was never under one master. The provision for employing an old *ganikaa* in the king's service, also shows that if she failed to come by a rescuer, willing to purchase her liberty for 24,000 pieces of money, she was treated like any other woman-slave of the king. The provision of different sums of money for release of her relations, (brother, etc.) strengthens this opinion.

Besides this *ganikaa*, who catered to the 'high' society, the state also had groups of prostitutes, who operated under the *bandhaki-poshakas* (see Ch. III, under *Bandhaki*) and channelled more money to the state-coffers.

From the little evidence available it seems reasonably certain that slave-labour used to be employed in the mines.

The existence of state-farms is not disputed and the clear statement of Kautalya establishes beyond any shadow of doubt, the presence of slaves, besides free-labourers, on these farms. The king's interest in this domain is not easily discernible in the two centuries preceding the Mauryan empire, although rich men had already organised such large-scale farming in the life-time of the Buddha himself. The employment of slaves, men and women, in the state-workshops is also attested in this text.

It seems that in the matter of security-arrangements, women-slaves played an important part, there being a special *corps-de-garde* of armed women-slaves for protecting the king's person at all hours. On the strength of the testimony of foreign accounts (see below), it can be presumed that these women-slaves were purchased in foreign lands also and given training to act as body-guards to the king.

At the end of this discussion, it will not be superfluous to examine the accounts left by foreign authors regarding slavery in ancient India. We must note at the very outset that generally people content themselves by quoting a single remark of Megasthenes and draw numerous inferences therefrom. We have found it necessary to take into account *all* the remarks of foreign authors and that is why it is difficult for us to share the almost

unanimous interpretation of that single and isolated remark of Megasthenes (taken in isolation even from some other remarks attributed to the same author by latter-day writers).

4. SLAVERY IN INDIA ACCORDING TO FOREIGN AUTHORS

In reading the descriptions of Greek and Roman authors of this period, we come across the following remarks on slavery in India: (*a*) ... Because according to the law, no one among them, under any circumstance shall be slave (Diodoros II.35.42); (*b*) ... The same writer [Megasthenes] remarks that no one, among the Indians, has any slaves in his service (Strabo XV.i. 53.6); and (*c*) ... Because they do not have slaves, they have a greater need of children (Strabo XV.i.58.60).[12]

These authors thus repeat the observations of Megasthenes who visited India towards the end of the 4th century B.C. These observations are quite categorical and apparently do not allow of any other interpretation. They are, nevertheless, wholly in contradiction with all the data available from contemporary Indian literature. In order to resolve this difficulty some scholars like Otto Stein claim that this remark of Megasthenes is an error. For others like R. C. Majumdar[13] it is a case of mistaken appreciation on the part of the Greek traveller, who has been misled by the extremely humane and sweet treatment accorded to slaves in India.

In our opinion, the problem can be examined from another angle because the hypothesis of humane treatment is not worth much thought, and we have, on the other hand, no valid grounds to doubt the genuineness of a remark based on personal observations. Actually, taking all these accounts together, we find that certain other remarks are also, apparently, false. There is, for example, the remark of Aelian: 'The Indians do not lend money on interest and do not know how to borrow.'[14] Now if we take this remark as applicable to the country as a whole, it has no foundation because the information contained in the Indian literature completely refutes it.

There is, however, another author whose remarks are in opposition to what has been said above regarding the absence

of usury but who also makes a statement which is not correct. According to Nicolas de Damascus, if an Indian is unable to enforce the repayment of money advanced by him as loan or left in deposit, he has only to blame himself for having relied on a dishonest person, because such creditors have no legal remedy.[15] We need not add that this remark on the absence of legal remedies for creditors is not correct, especially when it is applied to the entire country. We know, however, that given the size of the country, such a remark can be true of some particular region or community.

Therefore, it seems that the assertions attributed to Megasthenes can be true only if they were found to refer to some particular region or to some particular community. In fact, another foreign observer, Onesikritos has similar things to say about the Mousikanos: 'These people employ young men instead of slaves.'[16] This refers clearly to one community which did not practise slavery.

We may note that there are other remarks which can be true only when applied to a particular region or community. According to Arrian: 'The Indians marry their children without offering or receiving dowry. The father brings his daughter of marriageable age, to the public place and offers her to the winner of a tournament of wrestling, race, etc.'[17] Apparently Arrian has generalised this particular form of marriage (besides other well-known forms described in the Indian literature) which he had seen in some particular place or in some particular community. Coming back to slavery we can also note that these accounts do mention the practice of slavery in India. For example, Apollonios of Tyana has this to say of a village in the N.-W. of India. which, he says, was inhabited by the 'sophists': 'The villagers showed no more interest in the king or his brother than they showed in his slaves. Later the traveller learnt from the king himself that the latter owned twenty thousand slaves and all 'home-born' ones. Elsewhere the same writer informs us that the Indian ambassador who visited Rome had eight slaves, 'naked except for a loincloth'.[18] The request reported to have been made by Bindusara for sweet wine, figs and a sophist, to the Greek king (referred to by Hegesander and Athenaios) should be noted here. The Greek king is reported to have said in reply that the

sophists were not sold in Greece (implying thereby that a different law might have prevailed in the realm of Bindusara).[19]. McCrindle, who gathered all these accounts, has prepared a list of the commodities mentioned in the *Periplus*. Therein we learn that beautiful girls for royal harems as also slaves were imported at Barygaza from two Persian ports. He also mentions the export of women-slaves from India to the island of Socotora.[20]

It is noteworthy that according to Megasthenes himself, the king's palace had women-slaves: 'The king was waited upon by women purchased from their parents' ...(Strabo).[21] Far from disproving the practice of slavery, these authors, therefore, establish that slavery was prevalent in India. One of them, namely Philostratus in his *Life of Apollonios*,[22] talks even of the existence of manumitted slaves. The King of Taxila, then young and in exile, as also his four servants were supported by contributions from the manumitted slaves of his mother.

We can therefore conclude that according to foreign travellers slavery was an institution well known in India, excepting certain regions and communities.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Here we are at the end of our study of the institution of slavery in ancient India. We have, in the beginning (Ch. II), tried to give a general idea of the antecedents of this institution during the periods of Mohenjo-daro civilisation and the *Rigveda*. We have seen that it could have existed in the Indus society and in all probability had been left as a legacy (in certain forms) from that time onwards. Unfortunately the data is not copious and we cannot be more precise in the matter.

1. THE VEDIC PERIOD

In the Vedic period one can easily observe the distinction between two peoples, one white and the other black. They have also some cultural differences. The word *dasa* indicates the black skinned people who had been subjugated by the other. This fact of conquest confers the rights of master on the conquerers and the obligations of slaves on the conquered; so much so that thenceforth the word *dasa* begins to signify the slave.

From the legal point of view, the *dasa* is completely under the domination of his master and if we judge from certain verses of the *Vedas* (of the *daana-stuti* verses), he is included in the goods to be given in charity. A *dasa* enjoys no rights, all his possessions can be appropriated by his possessor, his master. The *dasis,* the women-slaves are sometimes taken as mistresses, but not as wives.

Since there is a mention of an entire people which has been made servile, one can conclude that the persons engaged in guarding herds of cattle, in agriculture, etc., as also their families, were designated together by the word *dasa*. Yet, one can also note side by side the existence of another group of servile status, who lived with the conquerors and worked for them. These persons could have arrived with their masters.

We should also note in passing, that the *Rigveda* does not prescribe any restrictions concerning connubiality and commensality with these *dasas* (except that a *dasi* cannot become the legally-wedded wife).

In the succeeding period, the ethnic distinction, so prominent in the *Rigveda*, disappears and it is no longer a question of anyone being a slave because of the colour of his skin. In the two epics, if we have to judge by the two main stories and by other stories included therein and already accepted as ancient, there are heroes whose skin is anything but white. And on the other hand, there are certain persons who, though *dasas*, do not have a black complexion. But from the legal point of view, the word *dasa* still retains its sense of a human being under the absolute power of his master. A *dasa* or a *dasi*, can be subjected to any treatment according to the desire of their master and there is no criterion, ethnical or religious, which can be invoked for their rescue. The masters take the *dasis* as concubines, but the infants of such unions are destined to be slaves. All these *dasas* continue to be considered and enumerated as part of the possessions of their master.

As regards their employment, they are mostly shown to be domestic servants in the homes of the princes. (This is in keeping with the nature of these epics, concerned chiefly with the life and affairs of princely houses.) Like the *Rigveda*, these epics do not prohibit commensality with the *dasas* because of their servile status.

2. THE PERIOD OF THE BUDDHA—KAUTALYA

In the Buddhist period, having regard to the social evolution, evolution in which a significant role has been played by technical progress, the institution of slavery had also developed to a considerable extent. It was well established and was accepted as something normal. Not only were there various types of slaves but authors had already started classifying them according to their origin or their functions (see Ch. V). Efforts were also made at defining the word *dasa* and keeping in view all the explanations, it is clear that a *dasa* is treated as any other item of

property, owned by his master and depending entirely, even for his life, on him.

It is interesting to note that in all these definitions or explanations of the word *dasa*, there is never any mention of the Vedic distinction between the *dasa* and *arya* and there is no mention of the *dasas* being the progeny of a people who had been vanquished at an earlier epoch. The ethnic distinction already absent in the epics does not reappear and one can observe a complete mixing up of the populations, giving rise to the disappearance of all cultural and ethnical differences. Henceforth slavery exists purely and simply in relation to economic factors: a person captured in battle or born slave can re-purchase his liberty and become one with the society of free men as one of them.

There are, however, regions where the situation is not exactly similar and where a group of persons has cut all social connections with the rest of the people by prohibiting connubiality and commensality outside their own group. This group of oligarchs has, therefore, extremely limited social relations and keeps away even the Brahmins and the merchants. It lives on the labour of a third group, that of the *dasa-kammakaras*, who are engaged in all kinds of productive work. In this society it can be assumed that this right of living on the labour of the *dasa-kammakaras* and of prohibiting all social contact with them, probably had its origin in an ancient conquest.

From the legal point of view, the *dasas*, as elsewhere, are considered the property of his master. The *dasis* are kept as concubines, and they, as also their progeny, enjoy no special privilege whatsoever. In the oligarch's house, they do not have even the privilege of commensality and certain places are supposed to become impure by the presence of a *dasa*.

The political-military defeat of these oligarchic regimes must have brought about certain changes inasmuch as the slave-system existing under monarchic rule must have found extension: Henceforth no group of people could be considered as being *dasas* by nature and slavery could have existed only as a function of economic factors or of facts which could be influenced by such factors. There could be no longer any question of a formal prohibition concerning commensality with the *dasas*; no

one thought any longer that the presence of *dasas* could cause impurity. But the *dasa* continues to be enumerated among the goods of his master and he is mentioned along with the fields, houses, cattle, horses, etc.[1] In the law of the land there is no provision for safeguarding the interests of the *dasas* and the *dasis*. The masters continue to keep certain *dasis* as concubines and regard children born of such unions as slaves. But there are, here and there, examples where *dasis* have been promoted to the rank of wives and where, although rarely, their children are manumitted.

If the extension of the monarchical system has in this manner influenced and modified the institution of slavery, by setting in motion a process of uniformity, it is quite reasonable to suppose that the establishment of the Mauryan empire must have transformed this institution still further. This is how we can interpret the restrictions envisaged by Kautalya against the abduction of persons by effecting raids. According to the *Tipitaka*, persons were carried away by force when raids were effected on villages in the adjoining territory and persons thus carried away were sold elsewhere as slaves. After the political unification of the country, such raids became inconceivable and this is confirmed by Kautalya.

On the other hand, this political unification puts into stride a process encouraging and facilitating the economic unification of the country and the development of a nationwide commerce. This favours the rise of towns and reinforces the economic power of the rich merchants. Now we know that the Setthis had interests both in the countryside and in towns. They owned land, sometimes entire villages—these latter being under the charge of their slaves or were given on lease to tenants. It is quite logical to think that this method of land-cultivation by means of slave labour became normal. Besides we know that this institution was not abolished under he Mauryans and that it continued to flourish. Therefore, debt-slavery, slavery due to famine, slavery due to war and that due to inheritance, etc. continued to exist although slavery due to raid was no longer tolerated. During the reign of Asoka, the war on Kalinga supplied thousands of soldiers and at least a part of them must have reached the Magadhan market.[2]

3. THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE EMPIRE

The disappearance of this empire brought about changes in the situation. It gave rise to small principalities, their very existence being an obstacle to a national economy, to a nation-wide commerce. This leads to the decline of big towns such as Patna, that is to say, leads to the decline of their population and wealth. This impoverishment implies the disappearance of rich families, having considerable stake not only in commerce but also in agriculture, because their farms, worked by servile labour, used to supply the towns with grain. In the absence of an imperial authority, capable of protecting the right of property, these farms could maintain themselves only with difficulty and the slaves had the possibility of improving their lot. We may suppose that cultivation by small peasants and tenants has spread still further. But in view of the economic inequality the poor might have been obliged to mortgage or sell either their children, or their wives or themselves. Such an offer of sale could have been met by persons having some spare money.

Coming back to Kautalya, we observe that the laws on slavery have evolved still further and that various facts of the everyday life of the Buddhist milieu, now form part of the laws on slavery. This is how the distinction between slavery for life and slavery for a fixed period, which we observe in the Pali literature, is now legally recognised and is used to give increased protection to persons reduced to slavery for a fixed term. Among such persons are included children mortgaged by their families in times of distress. The practice of mortgaging women to be employed as wet-nurses, as maidservants, etc., is now recognised and is governed by detailed rules. These rules concern not only mortgaged persons who are thus slaves for a limited period, but also *dasas* and *dasis* hired out for a limited period by their masters. As regards the *dasis*, Kautalya provides for the manumission of the one who gives birth to a son of her master. Moreover, for the first time, are such women protected against the uncontrolled lust of the menfolk.

Thus in the *Arthashastra* the power of the master over his *dasa* is not in all cases absolute, because certain categories of the *dasas* are afforded a very well-defined protection. We can,

therefore, conclude that the word *dasa* signifies not only human beings living under the absolute domination of their master and hence slaves in the real sense of the term but also human beings over whom the power of the master is limited.

Like the *Tipitaka*, Kautalya also does not know of any interdiction of commensality with regard to the *dasas* and does not associate any sense of impurity with them.[3]

Classical Slavery and Slavery in India

In the domain of their employment one does not come across slaves who are doctors, teachers, etc. Slaves are also not found among the artisans, except those who work in the king's workshops mentioned by Kautalya. Slaves are mostly employed in domestic service and in agriculture. They are also recruited into the army. However, nowhere are they to be found alone: they are found working along with free labourers (such as those who are paid a daily wage), small peasants, soldiers recruited from among free men. From this point of view, slavery in India does not resemble slavery in Greece or Rome *of the classical period,* where slaves furnished the predominant part of labour in certain branches of production, such as agriculture, mines, etc., and where they have been employed in liberal professions and also as artisans.[4] At this juncture, it would be worth while to study the reasons for this difference in the evolution of the same institution over a certain period, in India and in Greece and Rome.

In India, professions requiring a special training, such as that of charioteers, mahouts, etc., are exercised by trained people helped by their pupils. This desire of never revealing the tricks of the trade except to pupils of long standing, is also found in the case of manufacturers, artisans, etc. These latter have already been organised into guilds and perform their work with the help of apprentices, generally belonging to their own families.[5]

Hence, in the case of artisans, it is plausible to assume the absence of servile labour. As regards the liberal professions, the society in India had already (before the Buddhist epoch), solved the problem by handing over those jobs to persons coming from highly placed families or to highly gifted pupils, capable of attracting the attention of their preceptor. There was, therefore, no need for opening the ranks of these professions to

strangers. (We feel that the exchanges effected in these domains served the purpose of mutual information only. As exceptions, some doctors, coming from a foreign country, were employed at a royal court.[6])

We should also remember that even in Rome a good number of slaves who were doctors, preceptors, etc., had been free men in their own countries and had been driven to Rome after having been enslaved in war.[7] If, however, we are very keen to find slaves of Indian origin, trained as doctors, teachers, etc., we should look for them in countries like Afghanistan, Iran, etc. (in the Middle Ages, when prisoners of war from India were taken to these countries in large numbers).

We have now to consider the problem of servile labour in the countryside and their numerical proportion to other categories of agricultural workers. In this connection the immense size of the country must, first of all, be underlined. In fact, because of the great dissimilarity of geographical conditions, it is difficult to understand the logic behind the comparison of slavery as it developed in Greece and Rome and in India. If a comparison has to be made, it should be between the evolution of this institution in Greece or Rome, and in some region of India, such as the Punjab or Magadha. Further, if slavery had to become the main basis of production in an ancient society, the ruling classes must be able to control *all* the sources of food-supply. This was easy in a small country like Greece but not so in a huge subcontinent like India.

Right up to the end of the period under study, cultivated and cultivable land had always been plentiful.[8] The mild climate prevailing over large regions of the two valleys of the Ganga and the Sindh; the regularity, on a long-term basis, of the monsoon; a soft soil, rendered fertile by the alluvium carried by seasonal floods and other similar factors assured, on the one hand, a sufficient amount of production without any need for a big capital investment and allowed, on the other, to live with a minimum amount of nourishment.[9] To these reasons one can add the fact that the political unification of the country never lasted a long time and in times of anarchy, the right of property was among the first victims. In view of these observations, we may suppose that the slaves could always escape and seek shelter in

another state or that they could hide themselves in the forest where they could live a painfully hard but free life, by hunting, fishing and a bit of agriculture. They could also turn to brigandage.[10]

Coming back to our subject we find that these differences in the evolution of slavery are due to differences in material and historical conditions. In this respect two facts should be noted: In Greece the social evolution, including that of slavery, has taken place without involving the destruction of the material organisation such as that of the *polis*, etc. The effect of the transition from the non-ferrous metals to iron has been on the same society. In India, on the contrary, this change to iron has come about in a predominantly rural society, as the towns of the Bronze Age had already been destroyed. Obviously this involved the destruction of many things and institutions. Slavery, which was probably well established in the Indus Valley, must have been one of them. Thus during the transition from bronze to iron, slavery was not one of those institutions which were inherited in their original form. Having received serious blows, it needed time to develop again, just as every other aspect of the material organisation of the society did.

It will be interesting to speculate on all that might have taken place if the material civilisation had continued without interruption and, if later, the political unity realised by Magadha had continued to evolve without any break. (Let us add here that the material organisation of that epoch was incapable of ensuring the continuation, on a long-term basis, of the political unity realised in a big state.) It is, therefore, not enough to state that 'India never had a classical slave economy in the same sense as Greece or Rome.'[11]

To be more precise, the problem of the development of slavery in a country must not be studied in isolation from that of the development of State. This is so because, ultimately it is the State which ensures the appropriation of the surplus in production by the groups in power. It need not be said that the development of State has also been different in countries like India and this is so because, given the large size of the country and the poor means of communication then available, it was not possible to secure unconditional obedience from *each and every*

citizen. We may also note that the destruction of the state-apparatus of the Bronze Age, left an interregnum from which only the working people (slaves, servants, small peasants, artisans, etc.) could have benefitted. If this State had controlled the transition from bronze to iron, it is certain that the development of slavery in India would have been along different lines.

Before leaving the question of the difference between the Indian slave of the Buddhist period and Greek or Roman slave of the classical period, it should be observed that the social integration of the former, once he had been manumitted, was immediate and complete,[12] whereas such was not the case with the latter; the Greek slave, even manumitted, was considered a *métèque* and not a citizen; the Roman slave is deprived of the *jus honorum* and is kept away from participating in the conduct of public affairs. The Indian freeman mixes up completely in the free society, where he has often relations and friends. We should also not overlook the fact that in India, the ascetic's garb has been, for quite some time, a good protection to many and this is confirmed, in a negative way, by the prohibition made by the Buddha against ordaining runaway slaves. The Greek or Roman slave, on the contrary, remains a *stranger* without relations or friends, who are themselves free. In case of escape it is difficult, if not impossible, for him to find shelter in the house of a free man. He has only two solutions: resignation to fate or revolt.

4. THE SMRITIS

Before concluding this study, it will be perhaps better to pick up the chief points of this institution in the following period. For this summary examination we have selected four legal texts in Sanskrit, namely the *Smritis* of Manu, Yajnavalkya, Narada and Brihaspati. The information contained therein is, by the very nature of these texts, sufficiently precise and exact. From the chronological viewpoint, these four texts can be placed between the 2nd century B.C. and the 4th century A.D.[13] The facts are given below:

1. The power of the master over his slave continues to remain limited; a *dasa* if guilty of some crime can, for example,

be beaten only on the back; if a master beats a *dasa* on the head, he becomes guilty of a sin, equal to that of theft (*praaptah syaat chora-kilbisham, Manu* VIII-300). We should remember here the story of the woman-slave Rajjumaalaa.[14] Hence the word *dasa* does no longer signify a human being under the absolute power of his master, although he continues to be at the beck and call of his owner. We may also note that the son born of a *dasi* has the right of inheriting along with his brothers born of free women. This right is accorded to a son born to a *dasi* from a Shudra.[15]

2. The classification of the *dasas* in *Manu* resembles that of Kautalya, whereas the list of *Narada* is longer. The latter has fifteen types as compared to seven of *Manu* and nine of Kautalya. Here are the three lists.

	Kautalya[16]	*Manu*[17]	*Narada*[18]
1.	*Dhvaja-aahritah* (brought with the flag)	*Dhvaja-aahritah*	*Praapto Yuddhat* (obtained from war)
2.	*Udara-dasah* (stomach-slave)	*Bhakta-dasah* (slave of rice)	*Bhakta-dasah*
3.	*Griha-jaatah* (born in the house)	*Grihe-jaatah*	*Grihe jaatah*
4.	*Kritah* (purchased)	*Kritah*	*Kritah*
5.	*Labdhah* (found/received)	*Dattrimah* (given)	*Labdhah*
6.	*Daaya-aagatah* (inherited)	*Paitrikah* (received from father)	*Daayaad upaagatah*
7.	*Danda-pranitah* (brought by justice)	*Danda-dasah* (slave of justice)	*Mahato rinaat mocitah* (freed from a big debt)
8.	*Aahitakah* (mortgaged)		*Svaminaa aahitah* (mortgaged by master)
9.	*Atma-vikrayi* (who sells himself)		*Aatmanah vikretaa*
10.			*Pane jitah* (obtained in a bet)
11.			*'tava aham' iti upaagatah* ('I am yours'-come)

12.	...	...	...	...	*Pravrajyaa-avasitah* . (returned from asceticism)
13.	...	...	...	...	*Anaakaala-bhritah* (maintained in the time of famine)
14.	...	...	...	...	*Badavaa-hritah* (slave because of living with a woman slave)
15.	...	...	...	...	*Kritah* (made slave)

An analysis of the list of *Narada* does not reveal any new fundamental development. It is only a codification of already known facts. As regards the absence of the two last categories of Kautalya in *Manu*, we may note that the latter admits of their existence, although they are missing from his list. If we take up here all the lists that we have already examined, we will be able to say that the two lists of the *Tipitaka* are probably the most ancient ones. They can be followed by those of the Jaina texts, these latter being reckoned as anterior to those of *Manu* and Kautalya. The list of *Narada* will be the last.

3. As in Kautalya, the distinction between slavery for life and slavery for a fixed period is recognised. According to *Manu* a creditor can get work out of his debtor, if the latter is unable to pay his debt. Here a case of slavery for a fixed period is provided for.[19] On the other hand *Yajnavalkya* provides for the enslavement for life for one who returns from the ascetic life.[20] *Narada* is quite formal: the slave born in the house, purchased, obtained or inherited can be freed only when the master so desires. For the rest he prescribes conditions of manumission.

4. Like Kautalya, these codes also prohibit the abduction of persons. We can see in this connection *Manu* who prescribes the death-penalty for the crime of the abduction of men and women of high rank.[21] He also prescribes the *chaandraayana vrata* for one guilty of this sin.[22] *Yajnavalkya* considers the abduction of men and women to be as serious a crime as the theft of gold.[23] Elsewhere he declares: One who has been enslaved by force must be freed even if he has been sold.[24] *Narada* provides for the amputation of half the foot of one guilty of abducting a *dasi*.[25]

We may also note that in these codes the tendency of protecting the woman-slave is maintained. *Yajnavalkya* ordains a fine of 100 *panas* for a person guilty of destroying the foetus of a woman-slave,[26] and other fines in case of violating such women.[27]

5. Although *Manu* is very harsh on the Shudras, he also has to concede certain rights to slaves. We have also no grounds for agreeing with what is being generally said now, that he equates the Shudras and the *dasas*,[28] that the word *dasya* is to be accepted in the sense of slavery and the verse understood as signifying that the 'Shudra has been created by Lord for the slavery of the Brahmins.' Not only does this interpretation militate against a number of other verses of *Manu*, as for example, the one providing for the inheritance of a slave's son of a Shudra, IX 179, (if all the Shudras are born to be the slaves of the Brahmins, they can have no property, therefore no inheritance), but is also not accepted by a number of traditional commentators, who take the word *dasya* in the sense of 'work fit for a slave', this work having been defined elsewhere. The verse in question is then understood as signifying the duty of a Shudra, whether a slave or not (he could be a free person), to undertake all the dirty jobs that a slave had to do.[29]

Since the practice of untouchability has had an extension by now, the life of those groups of the Shudras, who are now treated as untouchables, becomes much harder than before. This in a way could mean some relief for a slave. We have just here no occasion for seeing if the slaves had become scarce or difficult to maintain. In any case the social and legal restraints on the Shudras compelling them to do the slave's work, did mean a change for the worse for the Shudras and could have led, at a later stage, to considering all the Shudras as the Brahmins' slaves, which was not intended by *Manu* and which is also clearly stated by *Jaimini* (VI-7-6), and *Shabara* in his comments on the latter.

6. As regards the method of manumission, only *Narada* gives certain details. According to him, a master desirous of manumitting his slaves, will take away a jar full of water from the shoulder of that slave and will break it. He will then shower some parched grain and flowers on the slave's head and repeat thrice: 'You are no longer a *dasa*.' This act symbolised the

cessation of his duty of carrying water. With this cessation all servile duties were discontinued for him.

It will be interesting to examine all the texts of the following period in order to have an exact idea of the changes that might have occurred. By so doing, it will be possible to have a general view of its development right up to its abolition in the 19th century. That can be the object of future research.

Appendix I

REFERENCES FROM THE DHARMA-SUTRAS*

i) *Black-skinned Women as Concubines*

1. One should not approach [for copulation] a *raamaa* woman after having prepared the sacred fire, [because] the *raamaa* woman, of the black skin, is intended for pleasure and not for the fulfilment of religious duty [*dharma*]. (Cf. Patanjali on *Panini*, i-2-45 and ii-3-69: a *dasi* or *vrishali* is meant for satisfying the pleasure of the people of higher classes.)

2. [A Brahmin] lying in bed with a non-Aryan woman should sit on a bed of dried grass with his back exposed to heat.

3. A Brahmin, having committed a sin by serving [enjoying?] a [female?] person of black colour during one night, obtains release from this sin by taking a bath in the fourth part of the night [i.e., during the last three hours of the night] over a period of three years.

ii) *Domestic Slaves*

1. [The ceremony of emptying the water-pot, symbolising exclusion from the caste of a Brahmin]: . . . A slave. . . takes a broken water-pot, [fills it with water] and empties it on a piece of ground covered with *kusha* grass, by making it topple over with his left foot.

2. Food brought by a woman slave during night time [should not be eaten].

3. [Food offered by men] who live by letting lodging or land [must not be eaten by a *snataka* of the Brahmin caste].

4. [If a Shudra comes in as guest] the slaves of the Brahmin [householder] will go to get food from the king's household and will honour him like a guest.

5. At his pleasure, he may stint himself, his wife, or his children, but by no means a slave who does his work [or his slaves and servants].

iii) *Brahmins as Landholders*

1. A non-educated or ignorant Brahmin who thus receives in charity cows, gold, clothes, horses, land or sesamum seeds is reduced to ashes like wood.

* *For the text, please see pp.* 121-22.

2. Gold is the first-born of fire, earth [here—land] of Vishnu and cows of sun. One who gives in charity gold, cows and land, enjoys their fruits for endless ages.

A cow, a horse, gold [and] land bestowed on an unlearned Brahmin, who neglects his sacred duties, prevent the giver [from attaining heaven].

3. Whatever sin is committed by a person in distress, he is purged thereof even by giving in charity land measuring only a cow-hide. The proper donation into worthy hands of a thousand bullocks, strong enough to be yoked, equals [in merit] the giving away in marriage of a daughter.

They declare that cows, land and learning are the most excellent gifts.

4. [A Brahmin may live] by agriculture and by commerce without personally participating therein or by usury.

iv) *Purchased Women*

A woman who has been purchased with money, cannot be considered as wife. She does not possess the right to take part [beside her husband] in ceremonies for the gods or for the Manes: Kaashyapa has called her *dasi.*

v) *Slave-trading*

1. In times of distress [a Brahmin] may earn his living by trading in authorised commodities and not by trading in unauthorised ones, such as human beings... meat, weapons... and trading in the hope about [the result of] good actions.

2. Food [may be exchanged] for food, and slaves for slaves, condiments for condiments, perfumes for perfumes and learning for learning.

3. It is permitted to [the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas to] barter sesamum, rice, cooked food, learning and slaves [each for its own kind and the one for the other].

vi) *Mortgage of Women*

1. The owner's right over livestock, land and women [pledged to another] does not get extinguished [even if the creditor keeps them for more than twenty years].

2. A pledge, a boundary, the property of minors, deposit [open], a closed deposit, women, king's property and that of a *Shrotriya* are not lost by being used [by a creditor beyond their fixed time-limit].

I

1. न अग्निं चित्वा रामाम् उपेयात् । कृष्णवर्णा हि
   रामा रमणाय एव, न धर्माय । वा०, 18-17-8

2. अनार्यां शयने बिभ्रत्...तृणेष्वासीत पृष्ठतप् । आप० I–9-27

3. यदेकरात्रेण करोति पापं, कृष्णं वर्णं ब्राह्मणः सेवमानः ।
   चतुर्थकाल उदकाभ्यवायी त्रिभिर्वर्षैस्तदुपहन्ति पापम् ॥ आप०, I–10-11

II

1. (पतितब्राह्मणपात्रनिनयनार्थम्)
   ...अकृत्स्नं पात्रं आदाय दासो...सव्येन पादेन प्रवृत्ताग्रान्
   दर्भान् लोहितान् वा उपस्तीर्य पूर्णपात्रं अस्मै निनयेत् । वा०, 15-11-2
   गौ०, 20-2-4

2. (अभोज्यम्) दास्या वा नक्तम् आहृतम् । आप०, I–5-16,31
   गौ०, 9-47

3. ये चाधिम् । आप०, I–6-20

4. (शूद्राय अभ्यागताय)
   दासा वा राजकुलाद् आहृत्य अतिथिवत् शूद्रं पूजयेयुः । आप०, II–2-4, 19-20

5. काममात्मानं भार्यां पुत्रं वोपरुन्ध्यान्न त्वेव दासकर्मकरम् । आप०, II–4-9-11

III

1. एवं गा वा हिरण्यम्वा वस्त्रं अश्वं महीं तिलम् ।
   अविद्वान्प्रतिगृण्हानो भस्मीभवति काष्ठवत् ॥ वा०, VI–32

2. अग्नेरपत्यं प्रथमं सुवर्णम्, भूर्वैष्णवी सूर्यसुताश्च गावः ।
   तासामनन्तं फलमश्नवीत, यः काञ्चनं गां च महीं च दद्यात् ॥
   उपरुन्धन्ति दातारं गौरश्वः कनकं क्षितिः ।
   अश्रोत्रियस्य विप्रस्य हस्तं दृष्ट्वा निराकृतेः ॥ वा०, XXVIII–16, 17

3. यत्किंचित्कुरुते पापं पुरुषो वृत्तिकर्षितः ।
   अपि गोचर्ममात्रेण भूमिदानेन शुध्यति ॥
   अनडुहां सहस्राणां दत्तानां धूर्यवाहिनाम् ।
   सुपात्रे विधिवद्दानं कन्यादानेन तत्समम् ॥
   त्रीण्याहुरतिदानानि गावः पृथ्वी सरस्वती ।
   अतिदानं हि दानानां विद्यादानं ततोऽधिकम् ॥ वा०, XXIX–18, 19

4. कृषिवाणिज्ये च अस्वयंकृते, कुसीदञ्च । गौ०, X–5, 6

IV

क्रीता द्रव्येण या नारी, सा न पत्नी विधीयते ।
सा न दैवे, न सा पित्र्ये, दासीं तां काश्यपोऽब्रवीत् ।। बौधा०, I–11-21-2

V

1. (ब्राह्मणः)
आपदि व्यवहरेत पण्यानाम्, अपण्यानि व्युदस्यन् ।
मनुष्यान्, ... मांसम् आयुधम् ... सुकृताशां च ।। आप०, I–7-20,11-2
गौ०, VII–14

2. अन्नेन च अन्नस्य, मनुष्याणां मनुष्यैः, रसानां रसैः,
गन्धानां च गन्धैः, विद्यया च विद्यानाम् ।। आप०, I–7-20-15

3. तिलतण्डुलपक्वान्नं विद्या मानुष्याश्च विहिताः परिवर्तकेन । वा०, II–39

VI

1. पशुभूमिस्त्रीणाम् अनतिभोगः । गौ०, XII–39

2. आधिः, सीमा, बालधनम्, निक्षेपोपनिधिः स्त्रियः ।
राजस्वं श्रोत्रियद्रव्यम्, न सम्भोगेन हीयते ।। वा०, XVI–18

Appendix II

NUMBERS IN THE TIPITAKA

In the *Tipitaka* many numerical specifications are to be encountered. Instead of simply stating that such and such a king was accompanied by a large retinue, it is generally said that such and such a king was accompanied by 500 women body-guards. It is easy to collect examples of this type. This characteristic has made it necessary for us to examine these numbers to see if we could make use of them and to what extent. We have, therefore, collected together all such examples from among the data on our study of slavery. By arranging them in ascending order we find that the numbers 100, 500, 1,000, 16,000 and 1,00,000 are used much more frequently than others (100-14 times, 500-51 times, 16,000-20 times and 1,00,000-20 times). We will, therefore, study these numbers with more attention. As regards the 'small' numbers, such as three peasants or four wives of a king, one can say that they are often credit-worthy. But it is difficult to take 'big' numbers as giving an exact expression to the real state of affairs. We can take the example of the story where a king is said to have a harem of 16,000 women or where a town had a population of 70 millions.

Let us take up the number 100 first. Its use in the *Tipitaka* reveals that is has been employed for real things as well as for the imaginary ones. The purchase of a woman-slave for 100 pieces of money,[1] the fee of a courtesan being 100 pieces of money for one night,[2] or a *nagara-setthi* owning 100 villages,[3] are facts which can be taken to be true. On the other hand it is a bit difficult to believe that one could easily receive 100 wives as gift.[4] It is also not easy to believe that the price of manumission of one princess could be fixed in so many hundreds of slaves (men and women), elephants, horses, etc.[5] In such cases the reader has the impression that these figures are mostly the result of a fertile imagination.

As regards the number 500, it is evidently a conventional number. A princess has almost always a retinue of 500 women,[6] the same being true of the wife of a rich burgher such as Visaakhaa,[7] of a rich courtesan,[8] or of a queen.[9] The Buddha

takes his cousin Nanda to the paradise and shows him 500 *accharas*, again 500 in number.[10] Elsewhere,[11] these *accharas* desire to give gifts to the Buddha. In the *Apadana*, there is a reference to 500 slaves[12] and to 500 *pacceka-Buddhas*.[13] A merchant has 500 bullock-carts for his caravan[14] and the Buddha and his disciples are followed by a group of 500 *vighasadas*, eaters of leavings.[15] The thieves, when in group, are generally said to number 500.[16] The same is true of the seafaring merchants.[17]

Let us now consider the number 1,000. Suddhodana Raja sends ten messengers, one after another, to bring back his son. Each of them has a retinue of 1,000 men.[18] The exceedingly imaginary nature of this figure becomes clear when we remember that the *total* area of the Sakiya territory was not very extensive. According to Rhys Davids,[19] the area in the plains was approximately 100 kilometers from east to west and 60 kilometers from north to south. (We may note here that the total population of Nepal, in 1941, was only 6 million.) In another story we are told that the sixteen sons of Bandhula, chief of the Kosalan army had, each of them, a retinue of 1,000 men.[20] The use of this number is so widespread that it is used to denote the price of a pair of the sandals of the Buddha,[21] the price of a robe prepared by a tailor,[22] the wages of forest-guards,[23] the amount of bribe acceptable to a police official,[24] the sum offered to his son by a mother to tempt him to see the Buddha,[25] and the travelling expenses of a rich young man.[26] We may also observe that the amount of fee payable to an *acariya* as also the tribute payable on the occasion of the birth of a heir to a throne are 1,000 pieces of money.[27] The sum demanded by a rich courtesan for one night may also amount to 1,000 pieces of money.[28] In another story a king employs 64 nurses for his son and deputes one nurse for each of the 1,000 children born the same day. Like the number 500, this number can also denote the number of women of a harem,[29] the retinue of a *naga* princess,[30] or that of a deva-*dhita*, daughter of some god.[31]

However, the editors of this literature do not seem to be satisfied with the use of the figure 1,000 for denoting the number of women in a princely harem and they have, often, for this purpose, resorted to the figure 16,000. A king will, therefore, be able to count up to 16,000 if he were interested in knowing the

number of women in his harem, most of these women being known as *nataka itthiyo,* dancers.[32] This increase from 1,000 to 16,000 applies equally to the harems of the gods, etc. That is how the harem of a *naga raja* has 16,000 *nagis* in it.[33] Even a Brahmin enjoying the pleasures of the paradise is waited upon by 16,000 women.[34] Here it may not be out of place to mention that a remark in the commentary of the *Jataka* makes us believe that in the beginning only the number 1,000 was used in such cases, as there the expression *itthi-sahassa-agge* (chief among one thousand women), is explained as *solasannam itthi-sahassanam agge* (chief among sixteen thousand women).[35] Henceforth this number of 16,000 will almost always be used to denote the population of princely harems. (Among exceptions to this rule we may note that the emperor Maha-Sudassana had 84,000 wives[36] and that the abandoned wife of the Buddha was chief among 40,000 *nataka-itthiyo,* of whom 1,090 were *khattiyakannayo,* daughters of the Khattiyas.[37]) Among these women of the harem a distinction is made in the case of 700 women known as *bhariyayo,* spouses, and who can be thought to have been duly married to their prince.[38]

It is difficult for us to explain the increase indicated above. We may, however, take notice of the remarks of Buddhaghosa who says: 'The *bhoga-khanda,* material riches, below 1,000 is *appa,* small, whereas beyond 1,000 it is big.'[39] It is not surprising, therefore, to find in later texts the substitution of 1,000 by much bigger numbers. This is how one can reduce to proper proportions such numbers as 46,000[40] (women kept by a prince), or 100,000[41] (virgins) or 300,000[42] (women).

The number 100,000 is also used to denote the number of *accharas.*[43] (In the *Apadana*-124, 101 times one thousand *accharas* are mentioned.) Elsewhere we learn that each of the four sons of a Brahmin receives from their father twice 100,000 pieces of money.[44] Visaakhaa, the rich woman-protector of the Order, has a light necklace valued at 100,000 pieces of money;[45] the wife of Sudatta Anathapindaka, another patron of the Order, lends to one of her woman-slaves a necklace of the same value.[46] The use of this number is extensive enough to be used to specify not only the prices of all sorts of things but also the price of a single meal of a prince,[47] and the price of a horse owned by the king of Kasi.[48] (However, we may be allowed to observe that the price of an excellent horse was about 6,000 pieces of

money, the average price being about 1,000 pieces.)

Now we may follow some details regarding the number 70 million. The town of Savatthi had a population of 70 million, among whom 50 million decided to follow the path of the Buddha.[49] In the town of Rajagaha lived 180 million people. In order to give some idea of the imaginary nature of such figures, we may mention that the population of the entire province of Bihar of today, Rajagaha being situated therein, does not exceed 40 million and that of the province of Uttara Pradesh, Savatthi being situated therein, is about 60 million.

Beyond the number 180 million, can be noted the use of numbers like 400 million or 800 million for denoting the amount of money owned by the Setthis. And even this is not enough in so far as the praise of the generous patrons of the Buddhist Order is concerned. Anathapindaka, who is said to have ruined himself by his expenses on the Order, had 180 million in cash, which he lost and had, besides, advanced an equal amount as loans. Moreover, he had spent a sum of 540 million for the purchase of the park of Jetavana.[50] All this adds up to the impressive but rightly unbelievable figure of 900 million. The wealth of Visaakhaa is described in equally fantastic terms. Her jewels had cost 90 millions in raw materials, gold and diamonds, and 100,000 in wages for the artisans.[51] To this we can add the sum of 540 million received by her for her toilet expenses. She had also received as part of her dowry 60,000 oxen and an equal number of cows. If we take the average price of a pair of oxen to be 24 pieces of money,[52] and accept the same for the cows, then the total value of such a herd will be equal to 24 x 60,000 = 1,440,000 pieces of money. The total value of 1,500 slaves at an average price of 100 pieces of money will come to 150,000. Leaving aside the value of each of the 500 bullock carts full of vessels of gold, of silver, of copper, of clothes of silk, of vessels of *ghi*, of rice, etc, the total value of her dowry comes to the big figure of 630 millions. Evidently her father must have possessed many times this wealth as he did not go out of his business after the marriage of his daughter.

Comparison with the Sanskrit Epics

In these epics, as in the *Tipitaka*, numerous numerical data have a hyperbolic character. But in addition, it is also found that

there is more or less a permanent relation between certain numbers and certain objects. The king Janaka gave in the dowry of her daughter, Sita, 100,000 cows, millions of woollen blankets, elephants, horses, chariots, a hundred virgins and two hundred slaves, men and women.[53] Kausalya, the chief queen of Dasharatha, owned 1,000 villages.[54] Bharata, overjoyed on hearing the news of the return of Rama, offered to Hanuman, the messenger, 100,000 cows, 100 villages, etc.[55]

On the occasion of his consecration as king Yudhishthira received, besides other valuable offerings, 100,000 woman-slaves, dressed in cotton clothes, and bedecked in gold ornaments. The Kiratas, though living in the poor mountain regions, full of forests, had offered him 10,000 women of their tribe accompanied by 10,000 woman-slaves.[56] It is, therefore, quite in order to find that this king maintained 88,000 *snatakas* and had deputed three woman-slaves at the service of each one of them.[57] If we believe Draupadi, 100,000 woman-slaves used to serve meals to the guests of the Pandavas.[58] Yudhisthira had also donated several thousand cows to the Brahmins.[59]

Even ordinary persons have a certain number of virgins and slaves, as is the case with Lopaamudraa in the house of her adoptive father, although he was only a petty chieftain.[60] In an effort to win the support of Krishna, Dhrtarashtra contemplates offering him 100 woman- and 100 man-slaves.[61] And here is Ravana offering to Sita 5,000 woman-slaves bedecked in jewellery.[62] Krishna, we are told, had obtained 16,000 women from the demon, Naraka.[63] In all these cases, the use of the numbers 100, 500, 1,000, 16,000 and 100,000 shows the identity of inspiration which establishes a link between the editors of the two literatures apparently so different.

Coming back to the Pali literature, one can notice the constant combination of certain numbers and certain objects. Let us take the case of woman-slaves. Ordinarily, they are never less than 100 in number. 'Please give me 100 woman-slaves', requests a Brahmin;[64] 'I give you 400 woman-slaves', says a generous donor.[65] In another story this number increases a little for stabilising itself at 500. Visaakhaa owned 500 woman-slaves. Rich courtesans have a retinue of 500 *vanna-dasis*.[66] The princesses and the queens have always a retinue of 500 women (e.g. queen Saamaavati, princess Sumanaa). However, in later texts, this is increased up to 10,000 and even up to 100,000.[67]

As regards the *accharas*, they are 100 in one *Jataka*[68] and 500 in the commentary on the *Dhammapada*.[69] Similarly Sakka is said to have in his service 500 *accharas*. (He had, besides, 350 millions of maid-servants.)[70] Elsewhere, however, there is no mention of these 500 *accharas* and in their stead we read of the 350 millions of his maid-servants.[71] In later texts, these maid-servants are, themselves, promoted to the rank of *accharas*: Certain passages speak of Sakka accompanied by 350 millions of *accharas*.[72]

All this systematisation, this association between certain numbers and objects or persons, could have had its origin in the need to commit to memory these long texts. We can, in this case, make a rapproachement between this method and that of repetition which, in more or less similar situation or identical contexts, consists of integrally reproducing the passages.

However, all this systematisation cannot establish the authenticity of these numbers. Rather on the contrary. They mostly serve to glorify the heroes of these tales. This constant effort of finding the hyperbole has led to the suppression of simple facts, so useful for our knowledge, by these numbers. Along with certain authors it can, however, be admitted that, despite their exaggeration, these numbers indicate the proportional value of things. But as regards the concrete aspect, their utility is almost nil.[73]

Appendix III

ON THE KAMMAKARAS

i. KAMMAKARA

The status of a *kammakara* or *kammakaara* is explained by the definition where it is said that a *kammakara* earns his living by working for a wage.[1] According to a commentary,[2] the *kammakaras* work for *bhatta-vetane*, the latter being explained as cooked rice and wages for fixed periods.[3] This expression *bhatta-vetana* is also explained as *devasika-bhattam ceva masakadi-paribbayam ca*, cooked rice supplied daily and a sum paid for expenses.[4] In the *Vasettha-sutta*,[5] a comparison is made between a Brahmin who lives by hiring his services and an ordinary Brahmin, and it is said that the former is only a hireling and not a Brahmin.) According to another source,[6] wages are paid with regard to the month, season or year. The *bhatta-vetana* received in lieu of work is called *bhati*,[7] which may be understood as salary or wages. To this *bhati* is connected the word *bhatika*, signifying a person receiving a wage or salary. If, however, this salary or wage consisted only of nourishment, such a person could be called a *bhatta-bhatika*.[8] But elsewhere,[9] we learn of a man who earned his living by *takka-bhati*, that is to say, by selling *takka*, butter-milk. In this case the idea is not that he used to work for others and received only *takka* as his *bhati*. In a town we meet a man who used to live by carrying water to others' houses. He is called a *bhatika* and is said to have earned his living by *udaka-bhati*. There was also, in that town, a woman who used to earn her living by the same means.[10] The word *bhataka* also denotes a man working for wages or salary.[11] In this particular case, he had been engaged for guarding a rice-field till the crop was ready and obviously he would have been paid only after the crop had been cut, any loss to the crop due to his negligence being adjustable against his salary. In another case a man had spent a few years in Kalinga, *Kalinga-ratthe*, earning his living by working probably as a coolie for the merchants.[12] In a *Jataka*-story,[13] a man obtains work on board a sea-going vessel, the very day the vessel was to weigh anchor. He is called a *kammakara*.

If sometimes *bhati* and *kasi* (agriculture) are mentioned as alternatives, one has to assume a state of affairs where land could be had for the asking.[14] We know that in the 6th-5th centuries B.C. land was easily available.[15] Possibly some of the labourers who worked in the fields, had implements of their own, as is shown in the story of Sumangala, who, born poor, used to eke out a living by working as an agricultural labourer and had a small plough of his own.[16]

A woman engaged in the service of a household is called a *Kammakari* or *Kammakaari*.[17] Sometimes such a woman could attract the master of the house and become his wife.[18] Other instances of women working as servants, for *bhati*, are found in the story of a mother-in-law who, expelled by her daughter-in-law, found service in the house of a friend's family.[19] In another case, the widow of a servant takes up service in the house where her husband used to work.[20]

The work done for *bhati*, wages, is also known as *bhati-kamma*.[21] We may also mention that the *bhatta-kammika*[22] was a particular servant of a certain king, deputed to give *bhatta* daily to the tortoises and fish of a certain pond. His *kamma*, duty, was that of giving *bhatta*. However a *bhikkhu-bhatika* is one who lives with the *bhikkhus* in a *vihara* and earns his keep by attending on them.[23] Another word to be mentioned here is *parikamma*,[24] which stands for service, remunerated or not. This gives us the words, *parikamma-karaka*,[25] meaning an attendant, and *parikamma-karika*,[26] denoting a woman-attendant.

According to a reference in the *Anguttara-nikaya*,[27] a shepherd was paid his wages every day, every five days, every six months or every year. We do not possess much information regarding the amount of money paid as wages. The few references that we have at our disposal, do not permit us to infer that they were high. Thus the man who lived by carrying water for others' households had saved only half a *masaka* for a day of festival.[28] It is, however, difficult to agree with the view that this coin was of silver.[29] Elsewhere a poor man prefers to get a cash reward by offering himself as a victim to a cannibal and thus provide for his old mother, whom he is able to support with great difficulty by *bhati*.[30] His daily wages are a *masaka* or half that amount. That the amount of remuneration was insufficient for a *kammakara* and his family becomes clear when we learn that the children of certain serving-folk cry for

yagu and *bhatta*.[31]

In another case, a man worked for seven years in the house of a rich man, obviously in return for food, and got a woman for wife at the end of this period. We are told that the woman did not stay with him and being pretty, was claimed by a king. This man is later shown as engaged in working on a road for *bhati*.[32] A Bodhisatta, once born in the house of a poor man, when grown up, takes up work with a Setthi, working there for a *bhati, bhatiya kammam karonto*. That he did not have an easy life is shown by the fact that he had only four balls of *kummasa*, junket for his breakfast.[33] It may also be observed that the example of a *dalidda-kammakara* once getting more than his due as wages, does not prove that all the employers were so very generous (they could not afford to be), and in this case, it is specified that he received this extra payment because he was to receive the Buddha and his monks for food the next day.[34] That our inference is not gratuitous is confirmed by other incidents in the same story where the monks say that in the house of that labourer they will have only a soup of the *jujube* fruit-juice. We also know that a certain woman, when expelled from her house, had to earn her living by working as a servant in another house and that she had a difficult time doing so.[35] Here we may refer to the story of the thousand Candala families who, although depending on work for *bhati*, did not obtain even a *bhatta-pinda* during a certain period.[36] Lastly we may refer to the story of a person who is said to have served others during three years so as to earn a *bhatta-pati*, a bowl of cooked rice.[37] Obviously this bowl of rice must have been in addition to what he must have received as food and shelter.

In an explanation of the word, *kammakara*,[38] we learn that a *kammakara* can be a *bhataka* or an *ahataka*. We already know the meaning of the word *bhataka*. By *ahataka* is meant a person who has been mortgaged, as it can be linked with the Sanskrit word *ahitaka* (from *dha*), well-known in legal literature and denoting a person mortgaged by his relatives or by himself and working for his new master, his wages serving to redeem the amount advanced against his person. It may also be derived from *hr*, to carry away, but in that case it will denote an abducted person, who was considered a slave and not a *kammakara*. (In any case, it need not be derived from the root, *han*, to beat.)[39]

In case an *ahataka* is a person mortgaged by others (his parents or relations), it is clear that the remuneration from his work does not go to himself but to those who have mortgaged him. An analogous practice is hinted at in the phrase *chabaggiya bhikkhuniya ... kammakaram upatthapenti.*[40] Possibly these *kammakaras* depended for their food and lodgings on these nuns, went out to work as labourers elsewhere and brought back the wages to the nuns.

Here we may take up those remarks of Kumarila also wherein he makes a distinction between *svamin* and *karmakara* and between *grhapati* and *karmakara.*[41] In the first case he says: '*yah phalam prapnoti, sa svami; yah parasya upakare varttate, sa karmakarah.* Here *upakara* does not mean an unremunerated service. In the second we read: '*yatha grhapatih svayam karma na karoti, anye tasya karmakarah bhavanti*' (as the master of the house does no work himself; others are his *karmakaras*).

Although most of these *kammakaras* or *bhatakas* used to live at the place of their work and thus near the residence of their master, yet those who were not in the service of a particular master, might have been staying in the poorer quarters of a town. This is hinted at in a story where a person, in need of service, goes to the *bhataka-vithi,* the lane of *bhatakas* and is employed by them collectively to awaken them in the morning on time. These servants, get up early in the morning and go out with their bullock-carts to bring supplies such as grass (fodder), wood, etc., for the town.[42] We may also observe that the literal sense of the word *kammakara,* one who does (some) *kammu,* work, had already disappeared and we have, in the Pali texts, only the *rudhi* sense of servant.

ii. VEYYAVACCAKARA

The first part of this word corresponds to the Sanskrit word, *vaiyapritya* (from which we have *vyaprita*) from which is derived *vaiya-vritya* of the Buddhist Sanskrit texts. It denotes attention, service and the complete word *veyyavaccakara* signifies an attendant, a servant. If we follow only Buddhaghosa,[43] such a person was supposed to go to the forest to cut and bring back wood from there and receive wages for the same. He could also be engaged in some other work.

Although it is difficult to find this word employed for a

slave, the first part of it is used to denote work done by a slave, as is the case with a *ghara-dasi,* who used to live by doing the *veyyavacca* of her masters.[44] Elsewhere we learn of a group of friends trying to find a prostitute who had run away with the jewellery lent to her, when she had been hired by an unmarried friend of theirs. This act of searching is described as *veyya-vacca.*[45] In the *Theri-gatha,*[46] *veyyavacca* is explained as *pari-kamma* (see above). In a *Jataka* story,[47] *veyyavacca* is explained as attending to bodily needs. According to Buddhaghosa,[48] a *veyyavaccakara* is an attendant deputed by rich men, desirous of earning merit, in the service of monks. He is also known by the name of *kiccakara,* one who does the *kiccas,* jobs. A clear explanation of the word is given in the *Vinaya,*[49] where we learn that nuns used to go to the householders and do their *veyya-vacca,* this being explained as cooking the *yagu* or *bhatta* or other dishes and washing of their lower and upper garments (*satakam, vetthanam*).

iii. UPATTHAKA

It is derived from *upa stha* and related to the words, *upa-sthaka* and *upasthayaka* of the Buddhist Sanskrit texts. It de-notes an attendant (paid or unpaid) or a servant or anyone who waits on his superior. Such a person is expected to cater to all the needs of his master and can be called the *sevaka* of the latter.[50] He may or may not be reliable. If he is, he is called a *dalhamanta,* one who keeps the secret of his master. A worker in reeds, engaged in the service of a king is called a *rajupatthaka nalakara.*[51]

A woman engaged on such duties is called an *upattayika*: such a woman could, because of the intimacy with her mistress, show her usefulness and thus become her *sahayika,* friend.[52] Of course, these persons were not always very loyal and could be tempted into accepting bribes to do injury to the cause of their master or mistress.[53]

The words *upatthahanto,* attending or serving,[54] *upatthaha,* serve,[55] and *upatthahitva,* having served,[56] are the verbal forms of the same word. In the *Vinaya* reference (about *upatthaha*) we learn that a prince, having become the *upatthaka* of a king, used to get up before and go to bed after his master. He was always at the beck and call of the king and tried to be agreeable

to him. Such then was the ideal set before a servant. The place where a person was expected to go to wait upon his superior is called *upatthana,* although this word, in its more accurate sense, denotes the act of serving or waiting. Thus in one story Sakka is said to have gone to attend on a Bodhisatta.[57]

PARICARAKA

This word is used to denote not only a person who roams about a particular place, its literal sense,[58] but also to denote a man who walks around a particular person, i.e., a person who is a paid attendant. This second sense, its more usual one, is to be found in the *Theri-gatha,*[59] where the word *kinkara,* servant is given as its synonym. The feminine for the same is *paricarika*, usually rendered as a maid-servant.[60] A variant is *paricari.*[61]

V. RAJA-BHATA

The word denotes a servant of the king and in the context under discussion,[62] signifies probably a retired or dismissed royal servant or soldier. In explaining this word, Buddhaghosa says that whosoever gets a salary and food, *bhatta-vetana,* from the king is known as *raja-bhata.* In this way the word *bhata* can be linked up with the Sanskrit word *bhrita.* The feminine form of this word is given as *raja-bhati*[63] and means a woman servant of the king. But clearly this extension of the meaning to embrace all sorts of servants of the king, is a later development, because the context of the *Vinaya* story shows that originally only *bhatas* in the service of the king were meant, that is to say the soldiers in the pay of the king.

In addition to these words, there are others, which can be called functional ones, such as *duta,* messenger, *pessa-kara* or briefly *pessa* (with *pessiya,* j. vi-67, in the feminine), messenger, *pada-mulika,* valet, *dovarika* and *khatta,* door-keeper. In all these cases it can be supposed that most of these jobs were entrusted to the slaves and servants. Similarly we have words like *attha-carika itthi* and *pesana-darika* for certain functions assigned to women and girls.[64]

We may end this examination by noting the word *missika,*[65] denoting an attendant of the female sex and of which the masculine may be *missaka.*

vi. Service in the Other Worlds

In the other worlds, too, which being more or less exact images of this one, the authors of this literature have not failed to provide servants for persons and creatures in good position. Thus Kubera is said to be served by *yakkhinis*. These latter go to his abode in turns and return to their own places after having served, usually for a period of three years.[66] According to the Buddha, semi-divine creatures like the *yakkhas* and the *gandhabbas* also have 'attendants' and 'servants'.[67] One such attendant, a *yakkhini*, is said to have died while in service.[68] In another story a bird, *Kunala*, is attended upon by a thousand female birds, who are called his *paricarikas*.[69] Similarly in certain stories, the *accharas*, nymphs, are described as servants of Sakka. Moreover, Sakka's name is also pressed into service to glorify the Bodhisattas and the Buddha and he is presented as a servant to them. Thus at one place we find Sakka coming to attend upon a Boddhisatta.[70] In another story, he is said to have insisted on the sole charge of cleaning the privy of the ailing Buddha and to have derived great pleasure in carrying the excrements of the Buddha on his own head.[71] (For words denoting both slaves and servants, see Appendix IV.)

Appendix IV

ON WORDS DESIGNATING SLAVES AND SERVANTS

There is a group of words which designate, according to the context, either a slave or a servant; sometimes both are meant. Here we propose to take note of those which designate either a slave or both a slave and a servant.

I. MAN-SLAVES

i) *Ante-vasi* (*Vin.*, I-216)

The *ante-vasi* of Suppiyaa, the rich woman of Banaras, must have been either a slave or a servant, as it was the custom of the time. In any case he was not a pupil of Suppiyaa's husband, the most common meaning of this word, and the meaning in which R. K. Mookerji interprets it.[1] (In fact we may observe that on one hand the *Tipitaka* makes a distinction between the *ante-vasi* and the *saddhi-viharika*[2] [two types of pupils] and on the other it uses the former to designate a servant or slave. We also find that this word designates one particular type of son.[3] This is its third meaning. Coming back to its meaning as slave or servant, we find that in contrast with the *ante-vasi* of Suppiyaa, referred to above, that of the Setthi Anathapindaka might not have been a slave as he held a responsible position. He was in charge of the agricultural work and was rich enough to have a gold ring.[4]

ii) *Ahataka* (*Vin.*, *IV*-224)

This word is found in the compound *bhataka-ahataka* and signifies a slave. It can be derived from the root, *hr* and explained as 'one who has been brought' (see, however, *PED*, II-117). One could also link it with the Sanskrit word *ahitaka*, derive it from *dha* and understand it as denoting a mortgaged person.

iii) *Cetaka* (*j*, *i*-350)

It signifies ordinarily a servant and a distinction is made

between a *cetaka* and a slave.[5] But in the *Jataka*[6], there is a slave, born in the family, *daso ama-jato,* who is called *cetaka.*

iv) *Duta* (*j. i*-92)

This word also has more than one meaning. It designates a messenger, paid or voluntary; a slave-messenger, an ambassador and even a piece of stone symbolically serving as the king's messenger. The meaning of a slave-messenger is found in the *Jatakas*.

v) *Manussa* (*Vin., i*-343)

Like the word *purisa* (see below) it means 'man'. There are, however, cases where servants and even slaves are meant. In a passage of the *Vinaya* (ii-158-9), this distinction becomes quite clear. A Setthi while talking to people who are not his servants, calls them *ayyo*, but uses the word *bhane* for talking to his own *manusse.* We know that *bhane* is used for talking to slaves and servants. In other passage of the *Vinaya* (iv-212) the *manussas* who served the meals to monks were, in all probability, slaves and servants as was the case with those of the king of Kasi.[7]

vi) *Purisa* (*D*, 23-9)

This word designating 'man' (*Vin.,* i-237) has been largely used to indicate a servant or slave. The distinction between these two meanings becomes clear in the *Digha Nikaya*[8] (23-9), where a *purisa*, a man is saved by the *purise*, the *'serving folk'* of the king. The *pesana-karike purise*, employed in the service of sixty nurses, could well have been slaves.[9] The same can be said about the *purisas* who brought hot water for a monk lying sick in the monastery[10] and the *purisas* who went out to buy some meat.[11] The *purise* who renounced the world along with their master, the younger brother of Asoka, as also the *purise* who accompanied the Prince of Ceylon, must have been slaves, obliged to follow their master everywhere.[12]

vii) *Sevaka* (*j, iv*-304)

In this context this word denotes persons condemned to serve as soldiers. This obligation, having its source in a royal decision, gives the sense of 'slave' to this word which otherwise signifies 'servant'.

viii) *Upatthaka* (j. i-350)

This word has more than one sense, all of them quite near one another. They signify more or less 'serving someone else'. Let us observe that in the compound *upatthaka-manussa,* 'men of the retinue', it gives the sense of *dasa-kammakara.* It is probable that its feminine form, *upatthayika* denotes the retinue of woman-slaves of a bourgeois lady of Savatthi.[13] (See also App. III.)

2. WOMAN-SLAVES

i) *Ante-purika* (Sp-s, i-92)

The 'women of the harem' described under this name, and who accompanied the Princess of Ceylon to a convent, must have included her slaves. This, however, is a later reference and we have not come across this word anywhere else.

ii) *Attha-carika* (j, vi-385)

This word stands for a woman who was at all times at the beck and call of her mistress. In all probability she was a slave.

iii) *Itthi* (D, II-9)

The five women who, arms in hand, surround a king, must have been his bodyguards and his slaves.

iv) *Pesana darika* (*Dh-a, i*-180)

The young girl referred to under this name in this story was most probably a slave girl. The same must be true of another referred to as such in another story.[14] Elsewhere a woman slave describes her duties as those of a *pesana-darika.*[15]

3. COMMON TERMS

Parivara and Parijana (*j, i*-147; *D-a, III*-v-16; *Vin., i*-15).

These two words denote the retinue of a prince or that of a member of the princely family. They are also used to denote the retinue of a rich person. We know that such a retinue was mostly composed of slaves.

Appendix V

DASA-KALPA IN THE ARTHASHASTRA

उदरदासवर्जम् आर्यप्राणम् अप्राप्तव्यवहारम् शूद्रम् विक्रयाधानम् नयतः, स्वजनस्य द्वादशपणो दण्डः, वैश्यम् द्विगुणः, क्षत्रियं त्रिगुणः, ब्राह्मणं चतुर्गुणः। परजनस्य पूर्वमध्योत्तमवधाः दण्डाः, क्रेतृश्रोतृणाञ्च। म्लेच्छानाम् अदोषः प्रजाम् विक्रेतुमाधातुम्वा। न त्वेव आर्यस्य दासभावः। अथवा आर्यम् आधाय कुलबन्धन आर्याणाम् आपदि निष्क्रयं च अधिगम्य वालं साहाय्यकरम्वा पूर्वं निष्क्रीणीरन्॥

सकृद् आत्माधाता निष्पतितः सीदेत्, द्विरन्येनाहितकः, सकृदुभौ परविषयाभिमुखौ। वित्तापहारिणो वा दासस्य आर्यभावम् अपहरतोऽर्धदण्डः। निष्पतितप्रेतव्यसनिनाम् आधाता मूल्यम्भजेत।

प्रेतविण्मूत्रोच्छिष्टग्राहणम् आहितस्य नग्नस्नापनम् दण्डप्रेषणम् अतिक्रमणञ्च स्त्रीणां मूल्यनाशकरम्। धात्रीपरिचारिकार्धसीतिकोपचारिकाणाम् मोक्षकरम्। सिद्धम् उपचारकस्य अभिप्रजातस्य अपक्रमणम्।

धात्रीम् आहितिकाम्वा अकामाम् स्ववशाम् अधिगच्छतः पूर्वः साहसदण्डः, परवशाम् मध्यमः। कन्याम् आहितिकाम्वा स्वयम् अन्येन वा दूषयतो मूल्यनाशः, शुल्कम्, तद्द्विगुणश्च दण्डः।

आत्मविक्रयिणः प्रजाम् आर्याम् विद्यात्। आत्माधिगतम् स्वामिकर्माविरुद्धं लभेत, पित्र्यञ्च दायम्। मूल्येण च आर्यत्वं गच्छेत्। तेनोदरदासाहितकौ व्याख्यातौ। प्रक्षेपानुरूपश्च अस्य निष्क्रयः।

दण्डप्रणीतः कर्मणा दण्डम् उपनयेत।

आर्यप्राणो ध्वजाहृतः कर्मकालानुरूपेण मूल्यार्धेन वा विमुच्येत।

गृहजातदायागतलब्धक्रीतानाम् अन्यतमम् दासम् ऊनाष्टवर्षम् विबन्धुम् अकामम् नीचे कर्मणि विदेशे दासीम्वा सगर्भाम् अप्रतिविहितगर्भभर्मण्याम् विक्रयाधान नयतः पूर्वः साहसदण्डः, क्रेतृश्रोतृणाञ्च।

दासम् अनुरूपेण निष्क्रयेण आर्यमकुर्वतः द्वादशपणो दण्डः, संरोधश्च आकारणात् । दासद्रव्यस्य ज्ञातयो दायादाः, तेषाम् अभावे स्वामी ।

स्वामिनः स्वस्यां दास्यां जातां समातृकम् अदासं विद्यात् । गृह्या चेत् कुटुम्बार्थचिन्तणी, माता, भ्राता, भगिनी चास्य अदासाः स्युः ।

दासम् दासीम्वा निष्क्रीय पुनर् विक्रयाधानं नयतः द्वादशपणो दण्डः, अन्यत्र स्वयम्वादिभ्यः । इति दासकल्पः ॥

Appendix VI

EXTRACTS FROM THE ARTHASHASTRA ON SLAVERY

I

a) (न सिद्ध्येयुः) ... दासाहितकाभ्याम्... । (III—1)

b) दासशब्देन वा दूष्यमालम्बेत । भार्याम् अस्य स्नुषां दुहितरम्वा
दासीशब्देन भार्याशब्देन वा । (V—2)

c) प्रेतस्य व्यसनिनो वा... अभियोक्तारं दण्डं दत्वा, कर्म कारयेत् । (III—1)

d) दिवसे पञ्चरात्रे वा बन्धनस्थान् विशोधयेत् ।
कर्मणा कायदण्डेन हिरण्यानुग्रहेण वा ।। (II—36)

e) स्वयम्प्रकृता राजदास्यं गच्छेत् । (IV—12)

f) परचक्राटवीहृताम्, ओघप्रव्यूढ़म्, अरण्येषु दुर्भिक्षे वा त्यक्ताम्, प्रेत-
भावोत्सृष्टाम्वा परस्त्रियम् निस्तारयित्वा यथासम्भाषितमुपभुञ्जीत ।
जातिविशिष्टाम्, अकामाम्, अपत्यवतीं निष्क्रयेण दद्यात् ।
चोरहस्तात् नदीवेगात् दुर्भिक्षात् देशविभ्रमात् ।
निस्तारयित्वा कान्तारात्, नष्टां त्यक्तां मृतेति वा ।
भुञ्जीत स्त्रियमन्येषां यथासम्भाषितं नरः ।।
न तु राजप्रतापेन प्रमुक्तां स्वजनेन वा ।
न चोत्तमां, न चाकामां, पूर्वापत्यवतीं न च ।
ईदृशीन्त्वनुरूपेण निष्क्रयेणापवाहयेत् ।। (IV—12)

g) न भोगेन हरेयुः । उपनिधिम्, आधिम् ..स्त्रियं, सीमानम् । (III—16)

h) परविषयाद्वा विक्रमेणानीतां यथाप्रदिष्टं राज्ञा भुञ्जीत,
अन्यत्र आर्यप्राणेभ्यो देवब्राह्मणतपस्विद्रव्येभ्यः । (गणपति
शास्त्री ... आर्यप्राणद्रव्येभ्यः) (III—16)

i) (अतुष्यतः) गुप्तपुत्रदारान् आकरकर्मान्तेषु वा वासयेत् । (I—13)

j) स्तेनम् अनिसृष्टोपजीविनंच बद्धवा कर्म कारयेत्, दण्डोपकारिणंच । (II–12)

k) ब्राह्मणं पापकर्माणम् उद्घुष्याङ्कक्तव्रणम् ।
कुर्यात् निर्विषयं राजा वासयेद् आकरेषु वा ।। (IV—8)

II

a) महापशुमनुष्य... (साहसे) द्विशतावर: पञ्चशतपरो मध्यम: साहसदण्ड: । (III—17)

b) ...एकं दासं दासीम्वा अपहरत: द्विपादवध:, षट्शतो वा दण्ड:। (IV–10)

c) ...कन्यां दासीम्वा सहिरण्याम् अपहरत:...वामहस्तद्विपादवध: नवशतो वा दण्ड: । (IV—10)

d) ...मनुष्य...अपहारिण उत्तमो दण्ड:, शुद्धवधो वा । (IV—10)

III

a) दास्या: गर्भम् औषधेन पातयतश्च पूर्व: साहसदण्ड: । (III—20)

b) दासस्य दास्या: वा दुहितरमदासीम् प्रकुर्वत: चतुर्विंशतिपणो दण्ड:, शुल्काबन्ध्यदानञ्च । निष्क्रयानुरूपां दासीम्प्रकुर्वत: द्वादशपणो दण्ड:, वस्त्राबन्ध्यदानञ्च । साचिव्यावकाशदाने कर्तृसमो दण्ड: । (IV—10)

c) स्त्रियं दासीमधिमेहयतां पूर्व: साहस दण्ड: ।
अदासीं मध्यम:, कृतावरोधामुत्तम:, कुलस्त्रियम्वध: । (II—36)

d) परिगृहीतां दासीम् आहितिकाम्वा संरुद्धिकाम् अधिगच्छत: पूर्वसाहसदण्ड:...(अध्यक्षेण गृहीतायां) दास्यां पूर्व: साहसदण्ड: । (IV—9)

e) (लिङ्गच्छेदनम्वधश्च) । सकामा तदेव लभेत । दासपरिचारकाहितकभुक्ता च । (IV—13)

IV

a) संसर्गम् बाह्याभिश्च प्रतिषेधयेत् । (I—20)

b) शयनादुत्थित: स्त्रीगणै: धन्विभि: परिगृह्येत् । (I—21)

c) स्नापकसम्वाहकास्तरकरजकमालाकारकर्म दास्य:, ताभिरधिष्ठिता: वा शिल्पिन: । (I—21)

d) दण्डप्रतिकारिणीभि:...वृद्धराजदासीभि: व्युपरतोपस्थानदेव-दासीभिश्च कर्तयेत् । (II—23)

e) ...याश्च अनिष्कासिन्य:...आत्मानं बिभृयु:, ता: स्वदासीभि: अनुसार्य सोपग्रहं कर्म कारयितव्या: । (II—23)

f) कणिका: दासकर्मकरसूपकाराणाम् ।...दासकर्मकरवर्गश्च विष्टि:। (II—15)

g) गणिकादासी भग्नभोगा कोष्ठागारे महानसे वा कर्म कुर्यात् ।
...मातृकादुहितृकारूपदासीनां घाते उत्तम: साहसदण्ड: .. ।
गणिका: दासी:...ग्राहयत: राजमण्डलाद् आजीवं कुर्यात् । (II—27)

h) (दुष्टसुराम्) दासकर्मकरेभ्यो वा वेतनं दद्यात् । (II—15)

i) वणिजस्तु...स्वदासीभि: पेशलरूपाभि: आगन्तूनां वास्तव्या-नाञ्च आर्यरूपाणां मत्तसुप्तानाम् भावं विद्यु: । (II—25)

j) ... दास्यो वा ... चारं निर्हारयेयु: । (I—12)

k) बहुहलपरिकृष्टायाञ्च स्वभूमौ दासकर्मकरदण्डप्रतिकर्तृभिर् वापयेत् ।... दासकर्मकरेभ्य: यथापुरुषपरिवापं दद्यात् । सपादपणिकं मासं दद्यात् । (II—24)

V

a) तेषु च एतावत् चातुर्वर्ण्यम्, ...एतावन्त: दासकर्मकराश्च... ।(III—35)

b) दासाहितकबन्धून् अशृण्वत: ... राजा विनयं ग्राहयेत् । (II—1)

c) स्वामी वा स्वकरणेन...पञ्चपणिकं द्विपदरूपस्य निष्क्रयं दद्यात् । (III—16)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Chapter I

1. *De l'esprit des lois*, liv. XIV, Ch. XV, p. 218.
2. *Histoire philosophique ... des établissements des européens dans les deux Indes*, vol. I, p. 78.
3. *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 424.
4. *Moeurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde*, vol. I, pp. 60, 63.
5. See F. H. Buchanan: (1) *An account of the District of Purnea;* (2) *An account of ... Bhagalpur;* (3) *An account of ... Bihar and Patna;* (4) *Journal of Dr. Buchanan.... Bhagalpur;* (5) *Journey through Mysore, Canara and Malabar*, vols. I & II. For a summary of the account of his journey through the districts of Gorakhpur, Dinajpur, Rangpur and Kamrup, see M. Martin, *History ... of Eastern India*, vols. II & III.
6. Quoted by D. R. Banaji, *Slavery in British India*, 1772-1843, p. 8.
7. See the case of the firm of Anjarcandy, *ibid.*, p. 60.
8. *Parliamentary Papers on Slavery in India*. London, 1834.
9. London, 1841.
10. Quoted by Banaji, *op. cit.*, and in *Slavery and Slave-trade.*
11. *Parl. Papers.*
12. See his remarks on the production of cane-sugar in Bengal in his book, *Remarks on the Husbandry and Internal Commerce of Bengal*, pp. 129-32.
13. See for example the case of two woman-slaves, who jumped over the wall of the Red Fort at Delhi (*Parl. Papers*, p. 42).
14. For two of these documents, written in Sanskrit, see JA, 1950, No. 2. An earlier sale deed is reproduced by Nathuram Premi in *Jaina Sahitya aur Itihasa.* This is dated, *Vikrama* 1288. He has also reproduced two similar sale deeds in Bengali.
15. Moreland, *India at the Death of Akbar*, p. 90.
16. *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité.*
17. *L'Evolution de l'esclavage dans les diverses races humaines.*
18. *Hastings Encyclopaedia*, 1920.
19. Actually Jolly has not added much to the summary of the Hindu Law given in the first paragraph of the article, Slave, in the *Cyclopaedia of India and of Eastern and Southern Asia* of Balfour, vol. III, p. 672.
20. H. J. Nieboer, *Slavery as an Industrial System.*
21. First published in German, Kiel, 1897.
22. English translation, p. 305.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 310.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 312.
25. *Ibid.*, 242.
26. 'Notes on Early Conditions in North India', JRAS, 1901.

27. London, 1903.
28. Vol. 1.
29. Rhys Davids, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
31. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *op. cit.*, p. 206. It is surprising to find Mrs. Rhys Davids speaking of the absence of figitive slaves in a passage where she quotes from the story of one such runaway slave, Katahaka.
32. *Buddhist India*, p. 63.
33. Among such authors we may mention S. N. Basu for his article 'Slavery in the Jatakas' (JBORS, vol. ix, pts. 3-4, pp. 369-75); L. Sarup for his paper 'Some Aspects of Slavery' (*Journal of the Punjab Historical Society*, vol. VIII, pp. 174-84) which lists *Manu, Mahabharata*, etc. on the one hand and Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, etc. on the other; N. C. Banerji for his views on slavery in his book *Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India* (vol. i, p. 27); and in an article, 'Slavery in Ancient India', (*Calcutta Review*, August, 1930, pp. 249-65); R. L. Mehta who gives his views on slavery as described in the *Jatakas* in the book, *Pre-Buddhist India;* A. N. Bose who first wrote an article 'Origin of Slavery in Indo-Aryan Economy' (JIH, August, 1940), and later incorporated the same material as a chapter in his book, *Social and Rural Economy of Northern India* (two vols.), and U.N. Ghoshal for his article, 'Slavery in Ancient India' included in the book, *The Beginning of Indian Historiography*, p. 36. For an extremely idealistic view of things in ancient India, in which there was nothing but plenty and where everybody had enough of everything, see the article on life in the *Jatakas*, published in *Dharmaduta*, (Banaras, 1937, vol. iii|8, pp. 50-64). R. C. Majumdar has nothing new to add to what was written by the Rhys Davids (AIU, p. 370). L. Renou brings out the difference between slavery for a fixed term and slavery for life, (*Civilisation Indienne*) whereas A. L. Basham expresses the opinion that 'India ... was never economically speaking dependent on slavery' (*Wonder That was India*, p. 152). Here one may also mention the attempt of S. A. Dange to present the evolution of the ancient Indian society exactly along the lines of the scheme of F. Engel's *The Origin of the Family, Private Property & the State*. Obviously this desire to show a conformity between the two has seriously affected the whole work (*India from Primitive Communism to Slavery*). It is a pity that D. D. Kosambi has not found it worth his while to re-examine the bases of the widespread opinions about the views of Kautalya and Megasthenes on slavery in ancient India concerning the phrase of the *Arthashastra, 'na hi aryasya dasa-bhavah'* (II. 13) and the remark attributed to Megasthenes that the Indians did not keep slaves. He has expressed himself merely on the basis of the generally accepted interpretation of these two statements (*Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, pp. 187, 220). An attempt along similar lines had already been made by O. Fris

in his article, '*Otrokarsky radve Stare Indii* (Slave-system in Ancient India, *Novy Orient*, Prague, VIII. 1953). Another article on the subject is that of Ilin: '*Osobennosti rabstva v drevnei indii*' (*Vestnik drevnei istori*, 1951, pp. 33-43). The little book of Ruben on slavery in ancient India, *Die lage der Sklaven in der altindischen Gesselschaft* (Berlin, 1957), attempts to show, on the basis of the *Jataka*-tales that there was slavery in ancient India. Nathuram Premi in his article, 'Parigraha-parimana ke dasi-dasa', (*op. cit.*, pp. 510-8), gives an objective description of certain facts relating to slavery in India as depicted in a number of Jain texts. We may also take note here of the views of K. M. Saran, *Labour in Ancient India*, who has put together mainly the data from the *Arthashastra* and a few *Smritis*. In his thesis, *Sudras in Ancient India*, R. S. Sharma has also dealt with the problem of slaves as and when occasion demanded it.

34. *The History of the Dharmashastra*, vol. II I, p. 180. Some of the latest to join this chorus of praise are the authors of *Bihar Through the Ages* (p. 235), who assert that the slaves in India 'were not subjected to the misery and oppression that was the lot of slaves in Greece and in Greek possessions.' Further the reader can, however, see for himself that most of these remarks on the 'humane treatment' are chiefly based in the imagination of the authors concerned. As regards this treatment in recent times, in a Hindu kingdom, governed by the Brahmanic laws, the evidence of an eye-witness, who occupied the post of the chief minister of that country (Nepal) may be of interest.

'Think what is the life for the domestic slave. Let us take the case of children. A good master will always have a gentle word for the child-slave but that child by his instinct, realises rapidly the difference between himself and others. When he grows up, his sensitivity and his intelligence grow with his years, his heart gets hard with respect to his masters, his neighbours, of the entire world. Although he may be living with children who are free, even if he were to share their joys, he remains nevertheless a possession and he is aware of it.... This child on growing, realises the bitter truth and he knows that he is a slave; tied to a servitude without hope he knows that he carries its mark on his forehead' (quoted by Lady Simon, *L'Esclavage*, Paris, p. 123).

'Similarly as regards the influence of the Brahmanic *Smritis* on the conduct of the masters, we may be allowed to quote the incident of Nepal, quoted in the book mentioned above:

'A slave woman had lost all of her children since her master had sold them one after the other. When, however, he desired to take away the last one and sell it, the mother in her despair, grew bold and approached the authorities for help. We are told that she had been trying to resign herself to her fate, by accepting her unhappiness and by consoling herself with what was left to her. She had been submitting herself to these blows of fate by

thinking that it was all the result of her *karma*, accumulated in her preceding births which now pursued her like shadow. But her resignation gave way when to her horror, her master with a hard heart, made arrangements for the sale of her baby whom she was still giving suck. She prayed, entreated, as you and myself pray to the Gods in Heaven when we see one of our dear children under the menace of the jaws of a hideous death; she prayed to the master, who, in this crisis was for her the all-powerful, as powerful as the cruel death itself. It was all in vain....

'The master took his stand on the legal position of a master vis-a-vis the slave and did not agree to spare the child even when the governor of the district concerned made a personal request, but it was of no avail. Seeing the futility of his exhortations, the Governor gave the required amount of money to enable her to purchase her child from the master, (*Ibid*, pp. 124-5.)

We may also be allowed to reproduce here certain extracts about the condition of slaves, both domestic and agricultural, in Tamilnad in early 19th century. Need we remark that the majority of the landowners were the extremely god-fearing Brahmins, whose life was regulated by the *Shastras*. Here is an eye-witness: 'The former (i.e. the domestic slaves) although employed on dirty jobs, lived in the company of, and often in intimacy with, their master, whereas the others (the agricultural slaves) were relegated to the fields and were, so to say, like the beasts of burden. Who among us has not seen in the Indian countryside, scorched by the heat of the sun, these cultivators, dressed in rags, working on land which does not belong to them, their bodies are thin, their faces are worried and they carry on their entire person the mark of profound misery.' (F. N. Lande, *Discours de Rentrée* pp. 35-6).

35. *Ancient Indian Education*.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 469.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 423.
38. We do not mean to totally deny their rôle. We know, for example, that if a country be kept cut off from the rest of the world, the wishes of the rulers of that country may constitute the chief, if not the only, force for change. But such physical isolation cannot be enforced for eternity since many forces beyond the control of such rulers tend to break this isolation. This has happened recently in Nepal and is likely to happen in certain Arab countries before long. It is, therefore, at least now, ridiculous to make such assertions, as is done, among others by K. M. Saran (*op. cit.*, pp. 25-6) and say that 'a large part of the credit for bringing about such amelioration goes to Kautalya.'
39. They wish to demonstrate that the development of the ancient Indian society was not marred by anything now considered bad, viz., slavery. The idea is to 'sell' ancient India or to present its course as an exclusive one. In this effort, however, these 'impresarios' of ancient India are only trying to compete with those who

see a miracle, the 'Greek Miracle' in the history of ancient Greek society.

40. 'Kumarila had received a large fortune from his king, owned many rice-fields, five hundred male slaves and five hundred woman-slaves and many hundred men' (Lama Taranath, quoted by S. C. Vidyabhushana in his *History of Indian Logic*, pp. 303-4). For Taranath's own account see the German translation of his work by Schiefner, p. 178. See also Buston, *History of Buddhism*, pp. 152-3, English translation by Obermiller, where one can read: 'Dharmakriti assumed the form of a slave and got work as a servant with the wife of his uncle, i.e. Kumarila.'
41. Lady Simon, *op. cit.*, p. 217.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 124.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
44. For convenience, we will refer to these two *pitakas*. as the *Tipitaka*.
45. Mlp., III-11.
46. The *Grihya-sutras* can roughly be placed between 400 and 200 B.C. (Renou, *L'Inde Classique*, p. 302; Kane, *Hist. of Dharma shastras*). Similarly the *Upanishads* can be assigned to approximately 500 B.C.
47. See Oldenberg, *The Life of the Buddha*, p. 160.
48. A., XVIII, 177.
49. See Appendix II for a detailed analysis of these numbers.
50. *Life in Ancient India*, p. 106. Also Nathuram Premi, *op. cit.*, pp. 510-8.
51. One should read the two books of R. Lingat, *L'Esclavage privé dans le vieux droit siamois*, and *Le vinaya et le droit laïque*, (BEFEO, vol. 37, part II).
52. K. Bhattachayra 'Temple Administration in Khmer Kingdom' (*Calcutta Review*, 2, 1955).
53. P. 147.
54. See the articles of R. C. Agarwala, 'The Position of the Slaves and Serfs as depicted in the Kharoshthi Inscriptions...' IHQ, vol. 29|2, 1953; 'Buddhist Monks in Chinese Turkestan', *Sarup Bharati*, 'Gifts and Presents in Kharosthi Documents', *Bharatiya Vidya*, vol. XVII, pts 3-4, and 'Religious Conditions as depicted in the Niya Documents', *Journal of the Greater India Society*, vol. XIV, pt. I. See also Usha Varma, *Madhya Asia ke Karosthi Abhilekhon men Jiwan, Samaj aur Dharma*, pp. 24-32.

Chapter II

1. Wheeler, *The Indus Civilisation*, p. 93.
2. S. Piggott, *Pre-historic India*, p. 133.
3. V. G. Child, *New Light on the Most Ancient East*, p. 174.
4. Wheeler, *Anc. India*, 3, 1947, p. 74; see also Childe, *op. cit*, p. 173-4. For more details on civilisation in the Far East, see

H. Frankfort, *The Birth of the Civilisation in the Far East.* For a study of slavery in this area, see pp. 61, 62 and 92. See also I. Mendelsohn, *Slavery in the Ancient Near East.*
5. Childe talks about a 'bourgeoisie of Harappa', *op. cit.*, p. 175.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
7. *Mohen-jo-daro*, vol. I, p. 92. See also Mackay, *Early Indian Civilisation*, p. 39; the author has found at Mohen-jo-daro, 'a wealthy administrative and merchant class, a large artisan class and many slaves.'
8. *Op. cit.*, p. 23; also *loc. cit.*, p. 76; Piggott, *op. cit.*, p. 138, calls them 'coolie labour'.
9. We may note that Heine Geldern thinks that the Aryans arrived in India between 1200 and 1000 B.C. (*Man*, Oct., 1956, p. 139).
10. However, Foucher, who admits the hypothesis of the entry of the Aryans towards 1500 B.C., thinks that the destruction of the Indus civilisation, as represented by that of its two big cities, took place somewhat earlier, towards 2000 B.C., and that it was the work of the Assyrians. (*La vieille route de l'Inde*, vol. II, p. 181)
11. Childe, *op. cit.*, p. 175; Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 33, finds therein at least four different groups. D. N. Majumdar says: 'The racial status of the ancient human remains is not easy to decipher, but there is not the slightest doubt that the various finds mentioned about and in Mohen-jo-daro and Harappa indicate a number of racial types' (*Races and Cultures of India*, pp. 25-6). We do not know, therefore, how Piggott (*op. cit.*, p. 261) has been led to find in this population the presence of a large proportion of the 'proto-australoid' group.
12. For our part, we believe that the Aryans had reached India in the Bronze Age itself and that they might have come hither, at first, as special traders. They could have found a place in the Indus-valley society. Of course, this does not prevent their joining the latter-day invaders or their fighting the latter-day invaders, although they both must have belonged to the same linguistic group. Such a possibility cannot be ruled out as is shown by the history of Greek tribes settling in Greece in successive waves. Moreover, the evidence of the Rigveda also points to the existence of antagonism among the Aryans themselves.
13. We have presumed this continuity of slavery in the framework of a perpetuation of the Indus tradition, both cultural and material, beyond this destruction which took place about 1500 B.C. Childe says: '(The Indus Valley Civilisation) forms the basis of modern Indian culture. In architecture and industry, still more in dress and religion, Mohen-jo-daro reveals features that have always been characteristic of historical India' (*op. cit.*, p. 184).
14. '. . . . Because it is hardly yesterday that it has been possible to take vehicles across the Hindukush' (Foucher, *op. cit.*, p. 184).
14. Debt of all types.
16. In the *Rigveda*, X-34, we read about a gambler, who having lost a bet, is taken away by the winner.

17. *RV*, V-34, VI-22-10, etc. Kane, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 181, says that 'it is possible that when the Dasas were vanquished in battle and taken prisoner, they were treated as slaves.'
18. *Ayasih purah*, II, 10-8.
19. *Anaasaah*, V, 29-10, *vrisha-shiprah*, VII, 99-4. *shishne-devaah* VII, 21-5, *mridhra-vaachah*, V, 29-10.
20. '....In the times of the *Rigveda*, there were two antagonistic camps of the Aryans and the Dasas or Dasyus; they differed in the colour of their skins and also in worship, speech and bodily appearance' (Kane, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 22).
21. See the *Nirukta*, XII-13, where it is said that a *raamaa*, a black-skinned woman, should be resorted to only for pleasure. The same opinion is expressed by the *Dharmashastra* of Vasishtha (XVIII, 17-8). Apastamba (I-9-27, 10-1) says that such a woman is non-Aryan, *an-aryaa*. Probably these women belonged to the people defeated by the Aryans. Here we may also remark that in the opinion of Louis Renou, the word *vadhu*, signifies, at least in the *dana-stuti* part of the *Rigveda*, a woman carried away by force and hence *dasi*. This contempt for the black colour is probably the reason for understanding the word *krishna-bhakhsha*, as 'eater of tasteless victuals' or 'of uncooked or unripe victuals' (*Khadira Grihya-sutra*, II, V-24). One wonders if the same could be the reason why a *brahmacharin* is enjoined not to look at, among other things, at *shyama-rupani*, persons and objects having a swarthy complexion, as this would cause an interruption in his vedic studies (*Kaushitaka Grihya Sutra*, II, VII-23). *Cf. Nirukta* on *krsno varnah*, II, 2.
22. *RV*, X-34.
23. B. Hrozny, *Ancient History of West Asia, India and Crete*, p. 140
24. *Ibid.*, p. 141; see also O. B. Gurney, *The Hittites*, pp. 70-1.
25. 'Before the Aryans, we had a considerable urban civilisation, comparable to the early Sumerian, in the Indus Valley. It would be incredible that this had been built up without class divisions, without a large surplus producing, agrarian population. The Aryans destroyed this culture down to its foundations; the *Rigveda* sings of Indra's having destroyed the cities, shattered the dams of the Dasyus or Dasas'.... (D. D. Kosambi, ABORI, 1951, pp. 261-2).
26. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, p. 356. But see also CHI, p. 86:

'We must, therefore, recognise that in the age of the Rigveda, there was going on a steady process of amalgamation of the invaders and the aborigines, whether through the influence of inter-marriage with slaves or through friendly and peaceful relations with powerful dasa tribes.' In fact we find that under more or less similar conditions sufficiently identical processes have been at work in later times. There is an example quoted by A. Princep: 'At the beginning of the 17th century,.... a scion of one of the families of the Bhojpur

Raja whose estate lay near Rohtas in Shahabad being urged by the spirit of adventure, and probably discontented with his subdivided heritage, proclaimed his intention of seeking lands above the Ghats or beyond the range of hills that rise on the south-side of the river Son, and invited followers to join in the undertaking. Some thousands of Rajputs collected round the standard raised by Bhugwant Roy who (in the year 1021 fasali ....) led his army into that part of the Ramgarh district which has been ever since and was perhaps before called Palamau. One encounter with the inhabitants was sufficient to insure the conquest of the country, which containing several cultivable and some already cultivated plains... became a valuable prey to a multitude in search of vacant territory. The chief of the invaders, assuming territorial dominion, proceeded to divide the land of the Pargana between himself and his followers, who increasing in number...., took possession of all existing villages to the exclusion of their former occupants. The revolution has been so complete, that at the present day the original and the wilder inhabitants are found to have no fixed interest or property in the soil and earn a livelihood only by slavery and hired labour' (Banaji, *op. cit.*, p. 37).

As regards the possibility for the slaves accompanying their masters, of improving their status, here is an example from history. According to Buchanan, the Khavas of Nepal 'are slaves and accompanied their chief as his domestic servants,' having been in slavery at Chittor. They are reckoned as a pure tribe and their women are not abandoned to prostitution like the slaves of the mountain tribes, called Ketis.' *Nepal*, p. 20; see also S. Lévi, *Le Népal*, vol. I, p. 274.

27. *RV*., II, 20-7; X, 22-3 and 86-19.
In the *AV*, V, 13-8, a *dasi* is said to have been born of a black-coloured one and the distinction between the *dasa* and the *Arya* can be seen in V, II-3. In another verse, the trickish and limbless fever is asked to go and strike the fugitive *dasi* (V, 22-6).
28. *RV*, I, 19-8, V, 34-6, VI, 25-2 and VIII, 40-6.
29. *RV*, VIII, 56-3, 19-36, I, 126-3 and X, 86-5; *AV*, VII, 90-1.
30. *Aitareya Brahmana*, XXXIX-8.
31. *Chandogya Upanishad*, 24-2. Besides Kane, *op. cit.*, one can read the remarks of Macdonnell under the words *dasa* and *varna* in the *Vedic Index*. All the references relating to the words *dasa* and *dasi* have been arranged under various headings in the *Dharmakosha*, vols. 1 and 2.
32. *RV*, VI, 22-10. In fairness, however, we must add that according to the authors of *Bihar Through the Ages*, 'Slavery is not referred to in Vedic and Brahmanical literature' (p. 171).
33. Siegel, *Slavery...*, p. 9; Mendelsohn, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
34. III, VI, 1-4. According to the commentary of Harihara, an *utula* is a *durvinita dasa*, a disgruntled or disobedient slave. See also *SBE*, vol. XXIX, pp. 350-1.

35. *Paraskara Grihya-sutra*, Eng. translation of Oldenberg, *Grihya-sutra*, SBE, vol. XXIX, where it is said, 'when pupils, companions or servants run away, they are to be rebuked with the *mantras*: May the rebuke of Indra always rebuke you... May Indra bind you with his bond, may he drive you back again.'
36. *Vedic Index*.
37. Even now in the plains neighbouring the Himalayas, i.e. in the Punjab, in Uttar Pradesh, etc., the domestic servants are mostly from the hills of Kangra, Kullu, Garhwal, etc. Not very long ago, a boy from Kangra would work and thus pay off the debt contracted for by his father. This was a type of debt slavery with a fixed period.
38. Wheeler, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
39. *Op. cit.*, pp. 109, 148.
40. Childe, *op. cit.*, p. 175, thinks that this type constituted the lowest rung of the social scale.
41. *D.*, III-16.
42. *J.* I-86.
43. See Chapter IV.
44. Vaasabha-Khattiyaa was born of this union, J. III-145.
45. Talking of the use of iron in Iran, Ghirshman says: 'The increased use of iron during the first millennium had a far reaching effect on the economic structure of society.... The use of new tools led to increased production, and this inevitably caused a considerable drop in the price of goods. Improved methods of agriculture opened up new tracts of hitherto uncultivated land' (*Iran*, pp. 86-7).
46. According to Gurney, *op. cit.*, p. 84, 'Kuzzuwatna'.
47. Childe, *What Happened in History*, pp. 162-3.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
49. *Taxila*, vol. I, p. 101.
50. *Ancient India*, 9, 1953, p. 123.
51. *Ibid.*, 5, 1954, pp. 13-4.
52. *Ibid.*, 10-11, 1954-5, p. 12.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 97.
54. *Ibid.*, 9, 1953, p. 112.
55. Marshall, *op. cit.*, vol. II, 534.

Chapter III

1. See Chapter II.
2. ii, 3-49.
3. ii, 3-49.
4. ii, 4-49.
5. iv, I-33.
6. iv, 30-1, 37.
7. *Ibid.*

8. iv, 38-40, 37.
9. iv, 7-26. One may add that in the *Mbht.* also (II, 17-31), *Kishkindha* is described as a "cave famous in the world" (*Guhaa-loka-visrutaa*).
10. vi, 13-2.
11. *Ibid.*, 14-6, 11.
12. *Ibid.*, 16, 17.
13. *Adbhutam*, vi. 23, 32-3, 60.
14. vi, 119-20, 111.
15. *Ibid.*, 19-112.
16. vi, 10-120.
17. vi, 19-24.
18. See Nieboer, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-5. 'Hunters hardly ever keep slaves. The preserving of food furthers the growth of slavery' and Lengellé, *L'Esclavage*, pp. 60-4, under the sections, (i) L'économie de cueillette est une économie de sous-emploi, (ii) L'étranger est un concurrent, il ne peut servir d'auxiliaire and (iii) Passage à des types socio-économiques supérieures and apparition de l'institution esclavagiste.
19. ii, 2-9, 2-15.
20. Here are the references collected by us: iii, 31-47; v, 34-43; v, 20-59; v, 38-51; vi, 16-17; vi, 10-40; v, 73-83; vi, 37-113; vi, 39-113.
21. ii, 17-5.
22. ii, 7-36.
23. See Thomson, *First Philosophers*, pp. 117-8.
24. i, 1-61.
25. iii, 76-7.
26. III, 94-24.
27. The first mention of this couple is found in the *RV*. I-179.
28. XIII-51 (Cal. ed.).
29. VII, 14-68 (Cal. ed.).
30. As only the main stories of the two epics are more ancient than the Buddhist epoch, the data presented hereunder should not be taken to have been dated accordingly. It is, in fact, an amalgam of facts belonging to a long period, ending somewhere in the opening centuries of the Christian Era.
31. XII, 254-39.
32. *Bhishma parva*, 415, p. 534.
33. ii, 72-16.
34. i, 77-22.
35. ii, 63-3-4.
36. ii, 63-28-30.
37. See chaps. IV and V.
38. V, 70-26.
39. XII, 173-32.
40. iii, 13-56.
41. i, 13-5.
42. ii, 60-27. However, for expressing the sense of 'the enjoyment of a woman-slave' see the word *dasi-bhoga* (see ch. V) which seems to be more suitable.

43. ii, 10-8.
44. XII, 67-11.
45. i, 100-26.
46. See p. 64.
47. iii, 256-11.
48. See pp. 87-8.
49. *Dasa-putra*, ii, 63-29.
50. See p. 69.
51. *Ram.*, i, 1-61.
52. i, 148-15.
53. iii, 256-9.
54. XII, 99-47.
55. i, 18-5.
56. ii, 54-12 and V, 158-28.
57. ii, 2-31.
58. ii, 2-80.
59. VIII, 29-34.
60. iii, 31-47.
61. i, 191-16.
62. ii, 48-10.
63. i, 1-74.
64. i, 190-16.
65. i, 132-64, as quoted by Altekar, *Women.....* p. 146.
66. *Vin.*, IV-274.
67. He tells his charioteer: At that time Karna called Draupadi, '*Dasa-bhaaryaa.*'
68. II, 68-9, 12.
69. See p. 70. Here we may note that *Apararka*, p. 512, quoting *Manu* (III-244), explains *jnati* as 'relations on the father's side': this strengthens our impression of a *jnati-dasi* being a woman-slave received from the father or from relations on his side. Cf. G. N. Jha, *Manusmriti*, vol. v, p. 264.
70. *It-a*, p. 29.
71. II, 2-9, 13-10. This reminds us of the *khujjaa* women in the retinue of the king Paayasi (D. XXIII-14).
72. II, 2-15.
73. II, 58-2.
74. V, 131-38.

Chapter IV

See K. P. Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, p. 394: 'From a statement of Patanjali it is clear that in a republic, there used to be slaves and artisans to whom the peculiar forms which denoted the citizens of a particular republic did not apply.'
Also V. S. Agrawala, *op. cit.*, p. 425: '...the political sovereignty was in the hands of the dominant Kshatriya class, who had founded the *janapada*... Patanjali definitely states that such

words as *ksaurdrakya* and *maalavya* denoted only a member of the Kshatriya caste, and not other sections of the population, such as labourers and slaves living among them'. Also A. S. Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India*, p. 360. See also R. S. Sharma, *JBRS*, Vol. 34. No. 4, 1953.

2. D., I-87.
3. j, IV-148.
4. j, I-88; Filliozat, *L'Inde...*, vol. I, p. 481.
5. *Dh-a*, I-337.
6. It is difficult to notice functions exclusively reserved for slaves. Ordinarily, the slaves and servants are mentioned together and the compound *dasa-kammakara* used for the purpose.
7. *D-a*, II-14: Did the hereditary troops, the *maula-bala* of Kautalya (IX-2), have a similar legal status?
8. j, VI-135, IV-304.
9. j, VI-489.
10. j, VI-138.
11. j, I-58; also Rockhill, *The Life of the Buddha*. p. 19.
12. j, IV-148, Bur., I-228.
13. *Dh-a*, III-254.
14. j, IV-145; Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 120.
15. j, III-162; *Vin.*, I-240; *Dh-a*, I-363.
16. j, III-105.
17. It is curious that the word signifying literally 'having the best' has been reserved for persons having only the best of materal means.
18. Bur., I-260; *Dh-a*, 1-398.
19. *Ibid.*, I-180.
20. j, III-293, *Vin.*, III-131 and Hor., I-220.
21. *Dh-a*, I-290.
22. j, II-378.
23. Bur., I-204.
24. III-64. It is some such landowner, referred to as *gaamasaamiko*, owner of the village, who commands the villagers (*gaamikas*) to assemble at his pleasure. These villagers are, later, called *kuti-purise*, men having huts (in the village) and are distinguished from women, sick people, men and woman-slaves (*dasi-dasas*), labourers (*bhatakas*), servants (*kamma-karas*) and others living in the village (*Mlp.*, IV, ii-8).
25. j, VI-69.
26. *Thig-a*, 55.
27. *S-a*, 16-11; Thg-a. 261.
28. j, iv-276. This Seth was extremely rich and is said to have donated large sums of money to the Buddhist Order.
29. *Vin.*, iv-262.
30. *Dh-a*, I-180.
31. In the *Tipitaka*, there is no reference concerning the wholesale burning of a forest so that cleared ground may be put under the plough.
32. This activity increased the total cultivated area and thus assured

the continuous provisioning of a regularly growing population. This is confirmed by the increasing prosperity of towns which were already in existence and the establishment of new ones. We can draw a similar inference from the fact that the Setthis who traded in rice, owned hundreds of bullock-carts for this purpose (j, I-467). In the story of the Setthi Mendaka the reader can observe that the major part of his agricultural production was destined for the market (*Dh-a*, I-381).

33. The fact of the Brahmins owning agricultural lands is confirmed by the *Dharma-sutras*, which speak against the donation of such lands to ignorant Brahmins. (*Vas*. VI-32). The praise of the donation of land and bulls, 'fit for the plough', is also to be found in the *Mbht*. (XIII, 66 and 73, Calcutta ed.). Elsewhere we learn that the Brahmins were not allowed to cultivate land themselves (*Gautama*, X-5-6) and it is understood that they could employ others for this purpose. These persons could be tenants, servants and slaves. A similar idea prevails in the *Grihyasutras*, where a Brahmin in enjoined to take to the occupations of a Vaishya only if the legitimate means available to him do not procure him a living. The means of living for a Vaishya being agriculture, raising of livestock, and trade in commodities (*Kaushitaki*, III, XI-44-6; *Shankhayana*, IV, XI-13-5). As the Brahmins are not allowed to take to plough themselves, it is said that they should get the work done by others. ('... *krishikarmaani kaarayet*,' *Shankhayana*, IV, XIII-1; *Kaushitaki*, III, XIII-1). Such people were asked to get their cattle marked by their *bhrityas* (*Shankhayana*, III, X-1, 2). As regards the employment of the slaves, let us not forget that the Brahmins could receive them in donation. In fact the use of such slaves on the lands of the Mithila Brahmins is confirmed by the two sale-deeds in Sanskrit (fn. 14, ch. I). They could not have accepted these slaves if it were contrary to the injunctions of the *shastras*. We also know that in the Himalayas (Kumaon, Garhwal) the Brahmins and the Rajputs used to employ slaves on similar works till 1843 and that they invoked the authority of the *shastras* for this purpose (*Parl. Papers*, p. 8). We can, therefore, suppose that in the Brahmin villages, agricultural activity was the responsibility of the slaves and servants. cf. J. C. Heesterman, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*, pp. 162-3.

34. *Vin*., II-180; Sp., p. 1274.

35. Hor., V-253.

36. Bur., I-232. Of course, there is some exaggeration in this story, but under the cover of caricature, the editors have tried to describe the life led by the heroes of the story—a life characterised by the absence of all productive activity.

37. j, I-57. The existence of a special ceremony to inaugurate ploughing is attested also by the *Grihyasutras*, where the Brahmin is asked to touch the plough on the first day after

reciting a verse of the *Rigveda* (*Kaushitaki*, III, XIII-10-2; *Shankhayana*, IV, XIV-4). A similar ceremony called *Sitayajna* is described in the *Paraskara*, II-XVIII. In the *Kathaka*, LXXI-1-6, we are given details of a ceremony known as *go-yajna*. The commentator, Brahmanabala, adds that in Kashmir, after the snows have melted and spring has arrived, the ploughs are got ready for this *go-yajna*. Other details then follow.

38. *Dh-a*, III-254; j, V-412.
It should also be noted that in the stories regarding the oligarchic regions there is often no mention of other categories of peasants. This is in strange contrast with the information that we have concerning the peasants in the regions controlled by kings.

39. Besides these different possibilities, one should also foresee the depopulation of certain regions under the plough, and which are thus covered by the forests once again. Such depopulation is recorded in historical times. In the Pali literature, we may refer to the forests of Dandaka, Mejjha, Kalinga and Matanga, all of which were at one time prosperous populated regions (*Mlp.*, IV, I-54).

40. j, IV-315.

41. j, V-278.

42. Only the King Mahaa-Sudassana possessed 84,000 (D, XVII-II-5) and the abandoned wife of the Buddha had 40,000 co-wives (j, IV-282).

43. j, VI-49, 144.

44. j, V-178, *gatha* 192.

45. D, XIX-49.

46. M-a, 82. The reader may note that among the 40,000 women of the Buddha, only 1090 were the daughters of the Kattiyas. Were the rest only *nataka-itthis?*

47. j, III-40, 408; *Thig-a*, verses 632-44. *natakiniyo* in the plural.

48. *Dh-a*, III-166.

49. j, V-278

50. j, V-259

51. j, VI-289. In the *Katha Upanishad* (I, 1-25), Yama, the God of Death, offers a number of women, mounted in chariots and having musical instruments to Naciketa and tells him that these women are not accessible to other mortals. But he would get them only if he were to desist from pressing his question about the world beyond. These women are called *raamaas*. References to woman-slaves, *dasis*, in the *Upanishads* may be generally taken to mean woman-slaves meant for pleasure (cf. *Brihadaranyaka*, VI, 2-7; *Chandogya*, V, 13-2).

j, VI-43

j, III-40; S-a, 35-115.

The remarks of Quintus Curtius (pp. 267-8) are interesting: 'The king is followed by a procession of concubines carried in

palanquins, this part of the procession is separated from the retinue of the queen (but) is equally splendid.'
55. j, V-278.
56. According to the *Vasishtha Dharma-sutra*, XIX, 33 and 34, the wives of the (deceased) king shall receive food and raiment but if they are unwilling, they may depart.
57. II-184. In another passage we find that the retinue of a prince is constituted exclusively of women (D, II-9). According to Strabo, (*Anc. India as described by Megasthenes*, pp. 72-3) when a king goes out on a visit, he is surrounded by many women. When he goes out on a hunting expedition, these women follow their master in chariots, on horseback or even on elephants. They are well armed.
58. *Dh-a*, I-190, 195, 203.
59. D, III-1-16.
60. S-a, XXII-11-V-4.
61. A-a, IV-IV-31-2.
62. j, I-84, Sp., p. 1004.
63. j, I-211, IV-370.
64. j, I-147.
65. j, IV-150.
66. j, III-93.
67. *Vin.*, IV-159; j, III-79; Bur., II-101.
68. I-21.
69. j, VI-230.
70. j, V-234.
71. j, I-52.
72. j, IV-370.
73. *Vin.*, I-271; Sp., p. 117.
74. j, I-290.
75. j, IV-37. Let us note that by analogy with the human beings, the editors of the *Tipitaka* accord the distinction of a retinue even in the animal-world. See j, V-417. Here we may also note that in the *Brhadaranyakopanishad* (VI, 2-7), we come across the word *pravaranam* which is interpreted by Shankara as *parivaranam* and therefore signifies retinues.
76. S-a, V-4, XXII-11.
77. j, VI-262. In the *Kamasutra*, however, *paricaarikaa* is enumerated among the different types of prostitutes.
78. *Thg.*; *gatha* 299.
79. *Thg.*, 53.
80. j, V-211.
81. Sp-s (I), pp. 55, 91.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
83. S-a, XXII-11; *Dh-a*, I-342.
84. It may be observed here that the women composing the retinue of a queen or of a rich woman were not always protected from the lustful intentions of the master, the king or the householder. He could take one of them to bed without bothering about her future. These women of the *parijana* existed only for

the pleasure of the master, as is observed in the *Markandeya Purana* (65-15). The women who thus became victims had no protection neither before law nor before the jealousy of their mistress. The grandmother of the king Vidudabha had, in similar circumstances, given birth to her daughter, and she remained a slave all her life. Here we may quote the advice of some ancient text (F. N. Lande, *op. cit.*, p. 42), wherein it is said that 'one should not entertain in one's mind the desire of (enjoying) the wives and daughters of one's intimate friend, of the king,... of one's slaves, of one's servants. Anyone who violates this principle will be thrown into the hell reserved for individuals attached to the illusions of this world.'

85. j, II-87; III-121.
86. j, VI-384.
87. j, VI-385.
88. *Dh-a*, I-180; II-260.
89. j, I-341.
90. *Dh-a*, I-215; *Thig-a*, 64.
91. j, III-309.
92. III-13.
93. j, VI-74.
94. j, I-57, IV-485.
95. j, VI-332; Sp-s, II-234.
96. j, II-224.
97. j, V-282.
98. j, VI-230.
99. Sp., p. 940.
100. j, II-325.
101. See the story where a nurse dares slap her 'daughter', J, V-282.
102. j, VI-1, D-a, XIV-I-34. The qualities of these nurses are better described in the Ayurvedic literature. *Sushruta, Sharira*, X-25, and *Caraka*, *Sharira*, VIII-51. According to *Caraka* the nurse must be *samaana-varnaa*, 'of the same varna' (as the child), *deshajaatiyaa* 'of the same country' and '*anantyaavasaayini*', 'of a caste not inferior than that of the child' (cf. *Ramayana*, *Sundara-kanda*, IV-19).
103. j, III-309.
104. j, V-296.
105. *Dh-a*, III-300.
106. *Thig-a*, 65.
Dh-a, III-157.
107. *Dh-a*, III-321.
108. It seems that these woman-slaves of the water-pot were often victims of the lust of powerful men. We infer this from the remarks of a daughter-in-law, who, sure of the support of her wealthy father, reminds her father-in-law that she was not a woman-slave of the water-pot (*kumbhadasi*) brought home from a well (*Dh-a*, I-400).
109. *Vin.*, II-154.

110. j, I-318.
111. *Vin.*, IV-19.
112. *Thg-a*, 17. Another word for the door-keeper is *dvara-gopa*. (*Kaushitaki Br. upa.*, I-3). The Sanskrit word *dvara-pala* remains unchanged in the *Mlp.* (IV, II-17).
113. *Vin.*, I-221. In the *grihyasutras*, water, seat, etc. are brought for the guest by the serving-folk of the householder, called in the commentaries, the *paricharaks*, *anucharas* or the *archaka-purusas* (the last term signifying the 'honouring people') of the householder (*Paraskara*, I, III-5, *Khadira*, IV, IV-5).
114. *Dh-a*, IV-210.
115. *Vin.*, I-237.
116. M, 56.
117. This door-keeper is not the same as the door-keeper who had control of the city-gate and who thus enjoyed a much higher social status (j. III-8, iv-289 D.XXVI-9; Sp; p. 422).
118. I-21.
119. *Vin.*, I-280.
120. S-a, XXII-11, III-8; *Vin.*, I-243.
121. j, III-142.
122. D, V-18; M, 51.
123. *Vin.*, II-109.
124. Bur., II-123, III-41.
125. *Vin.*, IV-159.
126. j, III-439, 497.
127. j, I-364, 451.
128. j, II-429, III-162; *Dh-a*, II-363 and A, V-IV-33, where the Buddha advises certain girls of marriageable age to look after the household of their husbands.
129. *Vin.*, III-35; *Dh-a*, II-17.
130. j, III-162.
131. M-a, 21-13
132. j, VI-117.
133. j, II-428.
134. *Vin.*, III-135; Sp-S, (II) p. 47. In the *Mlp.* (IV, VIII-10, 11) we have the term, *dasa-bhoga*, signifying slavery or the use of a person as slave.
135. j, I-484.
136. j. I-402. Here we may note the existence of a *jarad-dasa*, an old man-slave, who is asked to help a widow get up from her place in a ceremony held on the death of her husband (*Ap.G.S.*, IV-2-18 quoted by Altekar, *op. cit.*, p. 119).
137. The presence of these domestic slaves can be noticed also in the *Dharma-sutras*: see *Vas.*, XV-11-2: *Apastamba*, I-5-16, 31; II-4-9-11.
138. *Vin.*, II-159.
139. j, I-378, III-196.
140. j, I-108.
141. *Thg-a*, 37.
142. *Vin.*, I-243, IV-334.

143. j, I-295, 355, III-147, 361, IV-219; *Vin.*, IV-224.
144. J. Bloch, *Inscriptions d'Asoka*, No. XIII. It will be interesting to speculate regarding the effect of such a state of affairs on slavery: increase in the prices of slaves, difficulty of replacing them, etc. D. D. Kosambi, *op. cit.*, p. 196, however, does not agree that the key-word, *apavudhe* means 'carried off into slavery'. He says that these people were carried off for settlement upon crown lands. Apparently he does not deny that they were carried off and quite obviously they were made best use of on 'crown' lands.
145. D-a, II-37.
146. Vv-a, 62.
147. *Dh-a*, III-486.
148. Vv-a, 50.
149. M, 21-13.
150. D, XXXI, 27.
151. Bloch, *op. cit.*, No. IX.
152. *Vin.*, III-161; Sp-s, (II), p. 238.
153. It may however be observed that once, M, II-149, the *Tipitaka* puts the *totality* of four *varnas* constituting the Indian society, in opposition to the *ariyas* and *dasas*, taken as constituting the entire society in Kamboja in the country of Yona and in other frontier lands (*paccantimesu janapadesu*, *M-a* on the above.).
154. *Thig-a*, 47.
155. *Dh-a*, I-339.
156. M-A, II, 104-5.
157. The verse is as follows:
Na abhinandami maranam, na abhinandami jivitam,
kalam ca patikankhami, nibbisam bhatako yatha.
(Th, XI-606).
A similar verse is found in the *Mbht.* (XII, 237-15, Cal. ed.):
Na abhinandeta maranam, na abhinandeta jivitam,
kalam eva pratikseta, nidesam bhrtako yatha.
This verse is also found in *Manu*, VI-45.
158. M, 51; M-A, i, 246-7.
159. M-a on the above.
160. *Vin.*, i-276.
161. M, xxi-13.
162. Cp., VI-4.
163. *Thi-a*, 65.
164. Vv-a, 50.
165. M, 51.
166. M-a, xxix.
167. *Dh-a*, iii, 99: 'My master, festival-days are for the rich. I do not have even the rice-porridge for tomorrow. What have I got to do with the festival. Please give me the oxen so that I may go to plough the field.'
168. *Ibid.*, i, 296.
169. *Dh-a*, ii-3: The servant is worse off. The slaves such as the one purchased for money do manage to take rest by saying that

they have a headache or that their back aches. But a servant can have no such respite. He has got to carry out the orders received by him.

In emphasising the obligatory nature of such manual work, we do not wish to underestimate the role of certain incentives, such as good food, clothing, cash rewards, etc. This is hinted at in the remarks of a master who does not like good food being wasted on monks as with similar food he can get more work out of his slaves and servants. j, iv-376.

The same is borne out in a remark which Patanjali puts in the mouth of the *dasas* and *karmakaras* who say: (By working) we will be obtaining rice and clothes and we will not incur any blame or punishment (*Mahabhashya*, Nirnaya Sagara Press, Bombay, vol. iii, 68). On the contrary.

170. A, iii-38-i; A-A, i, 128. Elsewwhere in a story of three young men of aristocratic stock, we are told that they did not know even the source of origin of rice, '*bhattutthaanat-thaanam*'. Of course there is an element of exaggeration here but it goes without saying that these people did not have to do any type of manual work. In fact, the author himself says: 'these people, who born in noble families, did not know the source of origin of rice, how could they know the (details of agricultural) operations' (Dh-a, i, 135.) In a later text an aristocrat is made to say the following about himself: 'I had only the pure food to eat, I was a *chakkavatti*, an emperor. In my kingdom there was no need to sow the seeds nor to plough the earth, the paddy grown without effort, used to be eaten by the people' (*Ap.*, II, V-6, 7).

171. Let us add that the masters could, once in a while, be persuaded to undertake some manual work. In all descriptions of food served to the Buddhist monks, emphasis is always laid on the fact that the members of the family inviting the monks served the food themselves, with their own hands, *sa hatthaa*. (*Vin.*, IV-19). We also find that sometimes people of good families used to do manual work in the construction of religious shrines. It is interesting that the word used is *hattha-kamma*, which can be rendered literally as manual work (*Dh-a*, iv-64; Dh-A, iii-230). A similar practice of voluntary manual work on a religious site obtains even today in India. In the Panjab it is known as *kara-sevaa*.

172. D, ii-35.

173. *Rigveda*, ix-112-3.

174. The available evidence shows that this was not the only course adopted by the common people to escape from their miserable existence. Some of them at least did try to find an 'earthy, matter of fact' solution for their problems of misery and oppression. (See Ch. VIII, note 10; also our 'Notes on Some Ancient Indian Words,' remarks on *cora*, *JOI*, Baroda, vii, 4, p. 304).

175. The description of the early life of a monk is as given below: 'The monk *Sankicca* used to earn his living as a wage-earner,

and while at work he would wait *only* for the end of the day, with *no* interest whatever for the successful termination of the work' (*Th-a*, vol. ii, p. 257). A similar verse is attributed to *Saariputta* in the *Mlp*, (II-29).

176. *Thi-a*, 70. Naturally enough, this last simile is used to describe the state of complete mental felicity and makes the reader think that probably the idea of *moksa* (lit., release) owed, in its origin, something to the prevailing institution of slavery, as has been suggested in the case of Christianity. (See A. Donini, 'Myth of Salvation and Ancient Slave Society,' *Science and Society*, New York, vol. xv, 1). But we have to point out that in considering this aspect of the problem, some other factors have also to be examined. We have to note, for example, that along with the analogy of a freed slave, use is also made of the analogies of a prisoner who has been freed and that of a debtor being released from his commitments (M-39 and M-a, 39.).

177. *Supra*, p. 54.

178. j, ii-93; *Dh-a*, i-119.

179. D, iii-i-17 and commentary. This contempt for a person of high standing, because one of his ancestors was of slave-stock, is in contrast with an earlier epoch, where *rishis* born of *dasis* had composed some Rigvedic hymns. See, for example, *RV*. I-116, attributed to a seer named Kakshivan, whose mother was a *dasi* of a queen.

180. *Vin.*, iv-8 and Hor., ii-174.

181. A, v-iv-33. This is what it says: And those who are the household people of your husband, the slaves, the servants, etc., we will know what they have done by taking a note of things accomplished by them; we will know of what they have not done by taking note of what has been left unaccomplished by them; we will know the capacity and the incapacity of those who are not well. (For more details, see the commentary on the above.)

182. j, iv-320.

183. D, xxxi-27.

184. A, vii-v-44 and A-A, iv-45. This is what it says: 'O Brahmin, you have sons, wives, slaves, messengers and servants. It is they who constitute the household fire. Therefore, you should revere, respect, worship this household fire.'

185. A, v-xxiii-228. In the commentary it is said that such slaves and servants say to themselves: 'We get nothing to eat in the morning, we cannot work when tormented by hunger, so saying, they abandon work and sit aside.'

186. This is one occasion for them of having a holiday. Another opportunity presents itself, when there is a festival, when the new appearance of a star is publicly announced and a holiday declared (*nakkhatto ghuttho, A*, III-99). At such times a slave and a servant may enjoy themselves like everybody else. But this is

subject to two reservations. For the servant, as already pointed out, (163, *supra*), there was no paid holiday. The servant had, therefore, to forego his wage for the day. This is true, at least, for the wage-labourer. As regards the slave, he could be called out any time and sent on an errand even from the thick of merry-making. (M-a, 39-27).

187. D, xxxi-32 and D-a, iii-182. See the commentary for more detailed explanation.

188. This is explained in the story of the slave Bijaka who is extremely virtuous but is nevertheless a slave. We are told that his suffering as a slave is due to some bad acts (*paapam*) that he must have committed in an earlier life, j, xxii-235. We further learn that the idea about there being no consequence of acts is a wrong idea, a false view, *micchaa-ditthi*, A-A, v-265. See also *Baala-pandita-sutta*, M-129. It may be interesting to mention here some instances from the Chinese Buddhist sources. Gernet gives the story of a domestic slave who was so born, because in an earlier life, he had misappropriated some cloth belonging to a monastery. He quotes from *Fo ming king* to say that unpaid debts have to be paid by body, flesh and blood and that such a debtor is born as a slave, that such a person, as a slave does not get enough to cover his body and is always starving (Gernet, *Aspects économiques du Bouddhisme in Chine*. p. 68-9.)

189. Let us read in this connection the *gatha* which says that the master is the lord of his slave and has power to beat, to mutilate and even to kill him. The slave adds that for any similar treatment he bears no ill-will towards his master (j, vi- 300; see also, j, vi-219).

190. Thus we learn about a *devataa* that she was a domestic slave in an earlier life and had to put up daily with an extremely cruel master who would beat her, mutilate her at will. But as she was always able to control her thoughts of anger, she was rewarded with being sent to paradise to live there as a *devataa* with all the comforts and glory attached therewith (*Dh-a*, iii-314). That a good slave will always be obedient to his master is sought to be emphasised in the story where a snake does not bite a monk and the reader learns that in an earlier life the monk was the master and the snake the slave (*ib-A*, ii-248). Of course one would like to know the special reason which brought the slave back as a snake and did not let him go up as a *devataa*.)

191. Let us note that the Buddha did not countenance any breach in social rules and that he refused to accept any runaway slave into his Order. Almost all the slaves, who came and declared their status, had to satisfy the Order of the fact that they had obtained their manumission.

192. See pp. 39-40. See also our article: 'The Position of the Buddha ...' in J.B.R.S., Buddha Jayanti No. II.

193. *Vin.*, iv-181.
194. D. xvi-i-4 and commentary.
195. This implied equality of both master and slave points not so much to a recently-evolved belief that all men are equal, as to a painstaking study of the consequences of the same, reinforced by events contemporary to the life of the Buddha. We may also note that the interest of the Buddha in this social problem could not have been from the period immediately following his renunciation. At that time he was busy seeking an escape from a 'burning house' and was trying to save as many others as possible. It was later when the necessity for a long-term planning made itself felt, when it was no longer a question of seeking an escape from a 'burning house' to our mind represented by the fall of the oligarchic system, including the tragic massacre of all the arms-bearing Sakiyas. Then the question of building a 'house', of organising the followers into an 'Order, capable of lasting a long time must have arisen and the Buddha must have been obliged to pay attention to similar questions.

Chapter V

1. D, ii-72; see also M, i-39; j, vi-300.
2. M-a, i-39.
3. Nidd-a, i-60, 39-32.
4. D, I-72; j, I-226; j, I-77; Mlp. IV, VIII-7, 10, 11, etc.
5. M-a, 39-27.
6. *Ibid.*, ii-37.
7. Khudd-a, vol. i, p. 216.
8. M, 66.
9. Thig-a, 70. It should, however, be noted that the compound word *dasi-makancako*, j, VI-536, is to be separated as ***dasima*** + *kancako* and stands only for the names of two trees (PED).
10. M, I-126; j, VI-554.
11. ii-17.
12. This explanation is given once again in the commentary on a Khotanese text of the 10th century. See Dresden, ***Jataka-stava***, pp. 456, 476. In Sanskrit texts of later data, efforts have been made to give this word an apparently fictitious etymological derivation. The *Vacaspatya* explains it as follows ***'dasyate bhritir asmai,'*** 'as salary will be given to him' or, ***daasati. dadaait angam svaamine***, 'he gives his body to his master'. According to the ***Abhidhana chintamani***, a ***dasa***, gives comfort to his master. Kshirasvamin in his gloss on the word (in *Amrakosha*) says that a ***dasa is diyate dasyate vaa.***
13. IV-224.
14. Sp., p. 361.
15. D-a, II-35, also M-a, ii-51.

16. Nidd-a, p. 10. In order to bring out still better the meaning of the *kara-mara-aanito*, the words, *attano aruchiyaa vaa*, 'against his will' are added.
17. Rhys Davids enumerates the different types of slaves. He includes therein the prisoners of war, the voluntary slaves, those born in the family and those who are reduced to slavery as the result of a judicial decision. He has thus replaced the purchased slave by the 'slave because of a judicial decision' (*Dialogues*, I-101).
18. Thg-a, 68.
19. *Ibid.*, 17.
20. j, i-225.
21. *Ibid.*, i-451.
22. *Vin*-i-280. That such slaves could be sold away is shown by *Shabara* who says that a *garbha-dasa* is purchased for being put to work and a bull for carrying loads (on *Jaimini*, II-1-2).
23. D-a, i-16.
24. Dh-a, I-19.
25. ii-530; IV-139.
26. j, i-133; see also Vv. 50-8.
27. j, VI-117, *gatha* 496; for *geha-dasi*, Dh-a, II-468, for *gharadasi*, Thig-a, 30 and 572; Pv. ii-3.
28. *Gautama*, XXVIII-46.
29. Mitaaksharaa on *Vyava.*, 119.
30. j, VI-523, *gatha*, 1968.
31. j, i-299.
32. j-VI-546.
33. j, III-361 and *Kharassara jataka*. Hence the statement of R. S. Sharma (*op. cit.*, p. 92), 'that in the *Jatakas*, there is no mention of slaves captured in war', can be understood only if a distinction is made between a war and a raid.
34. III-147; IV-219.
35. *Vin.*, I-71.
36. j, VI-135.
37. Dh-a, I-20.
38. j, III-436; also Dh-a, II-217. For such voluntary slaves in Kautalya, see III, 13-47, where reference is made to people who offer themselves, their wives and sons as slaves if rescued from a dangerous situation. If later, these persons do not want to keep their word, they can obtain release on payment of a ransom fixed by experts.
39. IV, VIII-8.
40. In contrast, the Jaina texts mention six types of slaves: *garbha-dasa*, 'slaves born in the family', *kiya-dasa*, 'purchased slave', *anaya-dasa*, 'slave for debt', *dubbhikkha dasa*, 'famine-slave', *savriha-dasa*, 'slave for fine' (commuted into slavery for non-payment) and *ruddha-dasa*, 'slave of war' (*Nisitha-curni*, quoted by Jain, *op. cit.*, p. 107). The *Abhidhana Rajendra Kosha* (IV-1505), from the same source, mentions only four

types, excluding the purchased slave and the slave for fine). Can we say that this list is later than that of the *Tipitaka?*

41. j, I-199. They are not mere 'villagers' as understood by Mehta, *op. cit.*, p. 209, but 'thirty heads of families' of that village.
42. j, VI-389; Thig-a, 64.
43. IV, II-19.
44. j, VI-546.
45. Manu, VIII-416; *Mbht.*, I, 77-22.
46. *Mbht.*, III-128 (Calcutta ed.).
47. *Ibid.*, III-197.
48. j, VI-494.
49. j, VI-466.
50. *Vin.*, I.272.
51. Here we may mention that according to the *Dharmashastras*, Yajnavalkya, Mitaaksharaa on *vyav.* 27, a woman-slave, a *dasi*, should be touched on the head at the time of being given away in charity (*dasim shirasi daapayat*). In an earlier text (*Katha Upanihsad*, I, i-25), we are told that Yama, the god of death, was in a position to bestow, among other things, gold-bedecked women for serving a person of his choice.

j. VI-283.

D-a, II-14. In the Mlp, v-4, we have the variant as *dasika-puttaa* or *dasaputtaa*. Incidentally this list of professions (and of people belonging to various towns and regions) is much longer than that of the *Dighanikaya* and contains also such names as *bhatakaa*, labourers and *kumbha-dasiyo*. The latter word, here, stands, most probably, for a prostitute.)

This manner of recruiting slaves as soldiers is also fround later in the Middle Ages (under some of the Delhi Sultans) and has been in vogue quite recently in Hyderabad, where the Nizam had a battalion of Abyssinian slaves.

54. j, III-233; see also j, IV-40.
55. Panini, VI, 3-22; L. Renou, *Grammaire de Panini*, III-31.
56. j, VI-162.
57. j, IV-320.
58. j, VI-227.
59. Kautalya, V-2.
60. Khudd., Vol. I, p. 139; J, I-468.
61. Sp.-s (1), 215.
62. In order to avoid a special section for just this term, we have put it here.
63. M-a, 94. We are, therefore, unable to agree with Sharma (*op.*, *cit.*, p. 91), that this term signifies 'the Shudra who is a slave.' Buddhaghosa wrote in the 5th century A.D., but he had a host of older authors to draw upon. It is, therefore, not advisable to reject his interpretation so lightly, especially when there is nothing to corroborate the other interpretation. We may also point out that in the *Smriti* literature, a Shudra is said to possess wealth, including slaves. Thus Yajnavalkya (*vyav.*,

133-4), discusses the case of a son born to a Shudra from a *dasi*. Such a son is placed at a disadvantage as compared to the son born from a Shudra wife. See also Manu, VIII, 413-4.

64. R. C. Agrawala, *Buddh. Monks*. . . .,
65. *Vin*., II-15, III-180.
66. See j, III-413; Thg-a, 31; Vv-a, 396.
67. *Vin*., III-15, Sp-s (I), 238. See also *Jnati-dasi*. p. 37.
68. D-a, I, i-26.
69. Altekar, *Position of Women*. . . ., p. 183, quotes verses from the *Padmapurana*, *Srishtikhanda*, 52-97, and the *Bhavishyapurana*, I, 93-67, enjoining the donation of a *deva-dasi* and of a group of *deva-dasis* respectively. As is well known, this custom developed a great deal in medieval India and continued right up to the 1930s. It may not be out of place to refer here to an eye-witness account of the same, pertaining to the 14th century. Two Muslim travellers from Arabia, who visited India in A.D. 1351 have this to say of the *deva-dasis*:

    'There are in India, public women, called women of the Idol and such is the origin of this custom. When a woman has made a wish for having children, if she gives birth to a pretty girl, she carries her to the *Bod*, this is how they call their Idol whom they adore, and leaves her there. When this girl comes of age, she takes up a room in this public place, draws a curtain before her door and waits for those who pass that side, whether they be Indians or followers of some other sects. . . . She yields herself for a certain price and all the money thus amassed she puts in the hands of the priest of the Idol, so that this money may be utilised for the construction and the maintenance of the temple.' (*Anciennes relations de l'Inde et de la Chine*, p. 109).

    It is curious that later on certain sects of Muslims also started dedicating girls to their shrines. They were known as *acchutis*, the untouched ones, at Lucknow, and the Acchuti Galli of that city is their only reminder today.
70. Hence probably the absence in the *Jatakas* of the mention of the dancing girls dedicated to temples (*Ib*., p. 183). In fact one of the rare references to a temple is found in (*Mlp*., V-4), where a town is described as being beautiful on account of many temples (*bahuvidha-devatthaana-patimandi-tam*).
71. Dh-a, III-30.
72. j, VI-300.
73. j, V-282.
74. Dh-a, I-395.
75. For more details see our article, 'On Some Ancient Indian Words', in the *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, June, 1958.
76. Dh-a, III-157. Here we may quote Patanjali: '*Uda-haari bhagini, yaa tvam kumbham harasi shirasaa anadvaaham*. . . *adraakshih*', *Mahabhashya*, I-490. (O Sister, you who carry

water on your head in a pitcher, have you seen... a bull passing this way?).

77. Dh-a, III-321.
78. D-a, VIII-16.
79. Thig-a, 66.
According to information available in the *Grihya-sutras*, serving-men were also employed on this job. (*udaahaaram prahinoti, Kathaka*, XXV-1; *Paraskara* III, V-3 with the commentary of Harihara thereon.
80. D-a, i-i-17. This reminds us of the Vedic verse, where woman-slaves, putting their pitchers of water aside, dance, singing sweetly all the while (TS, VII, 5-10).
81. *Pali Dictionary of Proper Names*, II, 293; j, III-356.
82. Vol. I, No. 389.
83. See also Thig-a, 30 and 31.
84. j, III-356.
85. j, I-484.
86. j, I-402.
87. j, I-248; Dh-a, III-321.
88. AV, XII, 3-13.
89. A-a, IV-91; *Vin.*, II-139.
90. j, II-347.
91. II-319. But the compound word, *dasa-bhaaryam* (*Chandogya Upanishad*. VII. 24-2), merely denotes slaves and wives.
92. Baudhayana, i-11-21, 2.
93. j, II-347; M-a, IX.
94. Sp-s, p. 511.
95. D, i-i-70.
96. j. II-99.
97. D, XXXI-27, 32; Thg. 70; j, I-295.
98. *Vin.*, I-243; II-154.
99. *Vin.*, II-271.
100. D, XI-12-14.
101. III-68.
102. The legal status of a *kammakara* or *kammakaara* is explained in its definition. It is said that such a person, earns his living by working for a wage (*Vin.*, IV-75). The commentary tells us about a rich man who employed many persons and paid them according to 'month, season or year' (Sp-s, II-392). This sense is confirmed in the rebuke administered to Nanda, a cousin of the Buddha, Nanda is told by his fellow-monks to have become a *kammakara*, as he had agreed to stay a monk for getting fairies in heaven, a sort of wage for his labours (j, II-93). Woman-servants are known as *kammakaris* (Vv-a, 299). We may note that Kumarila (*Tantra-varttika*, pp. 1420 and 3185) takes the word *karmakara* in the same sense. We should, however, not mix up *kammakara* with *kammika*, which designates either a state official (Sp-s, II-462), or a person in-charge of the *parivaasika kamma* of a monk (*Ib.*, p. 1163). The same is true of the word *kammakara* in the compound, *kammakara*-

samgha (Vin., IV-230)). Similarly the word *karmakrit,* (*Kathaka grihya...,* X-2) denotes a *brahmacharin,* who attends to his religious duties or who waits upon his teacher. (For more details, see App. III).

103. D, V-18; M, 51.
104. D-a, V-18.
105. j, I-323, IV-320.
106. *Vin.,* IV-329.
107. A-a, III-38-1.
108. A-a, III-38-1; see also *Maha-niddesa, sutta* IV. A later phrase is *dasi-dasa-cetaka-parivaaraka-manussaa,* woman- and man-slaves, *cetakas,* and others belonging to the retinue (of a rich man). *Mlp.,* IV, V-2.
109. It does not refer to all those who 'care for morals' (R. K Mookerji, AIU, Bombay, 1951, p. 600), but to people who were the *upaasakas* of the Buddha.
110. *Apastamba,* I-720; II-2. In the *Mbht.,* (XII, 45-44 and 46-44), the sale and purchase of woman-slaves is condemned as leading to bad consequences after death.
111. j, I-299.
112. '...In the *Jatakas...* 100 *kahaapanas* is the conventional price of a slave' (Bose, *op. cit.*).
113. See Banerji, *Calcutta Review,...* the price of a slave ... 700 *kahapanas*'; Mehta, *Pre-Buddhist India,* 'The Brahmin begs for 700 *kahapanas,* which he considers sufficient for buying a male or a female slave.' Also Ghosal, *op. cit.,* p. 89.
114. *Mlp.,* IV, I-50.
115. Sp., p. 361.
116. j, VI-343.
117. j, VI-546. In a later work (*Mlp.,* IV, VIII-14), the release-money for the princess is only hundred objects of different species instead of seven hundred as given in the *Jataka.*
118. j, I-451, 458.
119. Sp, p. 999.
120. Dh-a, III-303. However, in an address delivered in 1872, at Pondichery, we find the following remarks, said to be taken from an ancient text: 'The slave could be recognised by means of certain external signs; he was not allowed to grow moustaches and there was a certain mark around his eyes which indicated his condition' (F. N. Lande, *op. cit.,* p. 40).
121. As is expressed by Basu, *loc. cit.*
122. j, VI-135.
123. S-a, IV-2-9. Similarly a king reminds one of his queens of her early state by saying that she was the daughter of a gardener and used to be clad only in a worn out *pilotikaa* (rags) (j, III-22).
124. Dh-a, I-234.
125. D-a, I-143.
126. *Vin.,* III-210: Dh-a III-341.
127. *Ibid,* I-234.

128. *Ibid.*, I-210.
129. j, I-69.
130. j, V-296. That these common, people, the *praakritaah*, had to sleep on bare earth, is also to be found in the *Mbht.*, I, 138-22.
131. Dh-a, III-303.
132. *Ib.*, I-239; *Vin.*, I-208.
133. *Vin.*, III-161, etc.
134. D-a, 33-32.
135. A, iii-38-i.
136. *Mbht.*, III, 62-38.
137. *kanjika-dutiyam sakundaka-bhattam*, j, V-383.
138. j, V-230.
139. j, I-422.
140. *Mlp.*, IV, VIII-28. According to Jagadish Kashyapa, however, this is a species of rice. (See his Hindi translation of the above, p. 359).
141. *Ibid.*, IV, VIII-31.
142. A slave-woman having given away her food-cake to the Buddha, says to herself that the latter had accepted it out of courtesy and that, having gone a little distance, he would give it to some dog or crow. (Dh-a, III-121).
143. j, III-299.
144. j, IV-376; Dh-a, IV-78.
145. Thi-a, 31; A, I-451, 459.
146. *Mbht.*, V, 34-47
147. A. L. Basham (*History...of the Ajivikas*, pp. 37-8) does not place any reliance on the servile origin of these two 'heretics'.
147-A. *Ibid.*
148. *Chandogya Upanishad*, III-16-7.
149. Malalasekhara, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 646; j, I-68.
150. Thg-a, 72.
151. *Vin.*, I-268; III-161; j, I-68.
152. *Vin.*, III-15.
153. D-a, I-16.
154. *Vin.*, IV-75.
155. j, II-331, II-206.
156. *Vin.*, I-243; j; I-323.
157. *Vin.*, II-158, 159.
158. D, IV-3.
159. j, II-185.
160. j, I-108, 350.
161. j, I-225.
162. D, III, I-13, 16 & commentary.
163. The commentary remarks that, in contrast, the vocative singular reserved for free women is *bhagini*, 'sister'. These two ways of calling women are known as *dasa-vohaara* and *ariya-vohaara* respectively (*Vin.*, III-15, 61; Sp-s, II-238).
164. j, I-68.
165. j, III-216.

166. Dh-a, I-180.
167. *Ibid.*, I-19.
168. Thig-a, 64.
169. *Ibid.*, 65.
170. *Vin.*, III-15.
171. '*Sisam dhopitraa adasam bhijissam karitraa*', D-a, III-I-23.
172. Ap-a, p. 263; see also j,, V-312.
173. Thg-a, 17.
174. D-a, III-23.
175. M-a, 39-32.
176. *Mlp.*, IV, VIII-9. For other verbal forms of the same, see *ibid.*, IV, VIII-14.
177. *Vin.*, I-76, II-271.
178. *Early Monastic Buddhism.*
179. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 212, 217, 218.
180. *Op. cit.*, p. 413.
181. 'The ascetic must live alone and in the forest', *Arthashastra*, I-3. Further Mitaaksharaa, on III-58, quotes Kanva as prohibiting the stay of an ascetic for more than one night in a village or for more than five nights in a town, except during the rainy season.
182. 'Regular work of any type whatever was completely alien to the monastic life.... All the instants and all the forces of the monk were occupied by the religious exercises' (Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 405). This is in contrast with the latter-day monastic tradition in the Occident, where the principle of *Laborare est orare*, work is prayer, was enunciated and accepted. In the tradition traceable to St. Benedict, 480-544, 'besides the work of daily religious services, the monks are to do "whatever work is useful', whether manual or intellectual. Agricultural work predominated the early days but soon schools grew up ....' (D.C. Somervell, *A Short History of Our Religion*. p. 147).
183. The reader may here refer to the gift of the *jeta-arama* or of the park owned by the courtesan Ambapali. Such parks were meant for the entertainment of the rich citizens and some of them, through gift, became the property of the Buddhist Order. It may not be out of place to mention that in the *Grihya-sutras*, *Shankhayana*, V, III-1, details of the consecration of such a park are given.
184. *Vin.*, III-248; Sp., p. 709. The wife of an *aramika* is called *aramikini*. In the Chinese sources this story is retold and it is said that King Bimbisara made a gift of lands, houses and 500 criminals condemned to death (*Che Song*, k. 34, p. 250c-251a, quoted by Gernet, *op. cit.*, p. 124). According to *K'ie-lan ki*, k. 5, p. 1018, the kings of Wei in Central Asia were 'always anxious to conform to the Buddhist tradition' and that the King of Khotan put 400 families at the disposal of a big Buddhist monastery (*ibid.*, pp. 124-5).
185. Ap., VI, Upali, verse 24.

185a. In the Sanskrit literature, we notice the existence of a similar person called, *arama-poshaka*, for whom the *arama* is the provider of a living (Shabara on Jaimini, IX, 1-2-1).

186. *Vin.*, II-6. This problem of supervising the work of the slaves seems to have arisen in Central Asia also. (See *Ancient Khotan*. App. A, Chinese Documents, No. 16).
For N. Dutt, however, the *aramika-pessaka* is the overseer of the *labourers* engaged for construction or repair-work. Moreover he writes nothing regarding the *aramikas*. (*Early Monastic Buddhism*, vol. I. p. 323).

187. Dh-a, III-72.

188. Thg-a, 17.

189. Cited by Rahula, *op. cit.*, p. 146. Later the word came to denote a servant of the *Samgha* or anyone who would serve or like to serve the *Samgha*, as shown by the use of the word in the *Mlp.*, I-17 (*aham samghassa aramiko*).

190. *Supra*, p. 183.

191. Dh-a, I-19.

192. A free man could also be a *kappiya-karaka*.

193. Sp-s, II-204.

194. *Nan hai*, k. 4, p. 230a-c, referred to by Lingat, *Le Vinaya... op. cit.*

195. *Kao Seng Fa-hsien tchoun*, 2085, p. 859b, quoted by Gernet, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-4.

196. Quoted by R. C. Mitra, *Le déclin du Buddhisme dans l'Inde*, thesis presented at the Sorbonne, 1949, p. 17.

197. Gernet, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

198. *Ibid.*, p. 63.

199. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-6.

200. For details see *supra*, p. 14.

201. '*Bhante*, never have we heard of similar requests for good food made by monks; neither our *fathers* nor our *grandfathers* ever told us of any monk who made such a request,' says an *aramika* to the chief monk of a monastery in Ceylon (Sp-s, II-213).

Chapter VI

Mark the phrase *bharyaam...snushaam...duhitaram va* (wife, daughter-in-law or daughter), which answers perfectly to the Pali phrase, *kula-itthi, kula-sunhaa, kula-dhitaa.*

This means that even if a debtor fails to redeem a woman pledged by him, at the expiry of the stipulated period, he does not forfeit his right to her (cf. Remarks of the *Dharmasutras*, p. 120).

Gautama, xii, 46-7, says that a Brahmin should not suffer physical punishment. He should be prohibited from carrying on his duties, his crime should be announced publicly and his body may be marked with a sign (appropriate to the crime committed by him).

4. This reminds us of the verse in the *Mbht.*, II, 5-77, which describes the bodyguard of Yudhishthira as being clad in red, wearing ornaments and swords in hand for guarding the king.
5. *Rupa-dasi*: According to T. Ganapati Shastri, she is a *pratikarma-dasi*. *Shamashastri* quotes a commentator to designate her as a woman 'engaged in making garlands and the like'.
6. According to the *Grihya-sutras*, things offered at the *shraddha* ceremony, including wine, should be consumed, among others by the *preshyas*, the serving folk (*Kathaka*, lxv-8: also *Paraskara*, III, iii-11).
7. See p. 65.
8. See p. 53.
9. *Manu*, VIII, 416; *Mbht.*, I, 77-22.
10. As had happened in the case of Vidudabha, the son and successor of the king of Kosala and his mother, born of a slave-mother. j, III-145.
11. *Manu*, VIII-416, *Mbht.*, I, 77-22.
12. All these quotations are taken from various volumes edited by McCrindle: (i) *The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great;* (ii) *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes;* (iii) *Ancient India as described by Ktesias;* (iv) *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature;* (v) *India of Arrian.*
13. A.I.U., p. 26.
14. Aelian, V-1, IV-1.
15. XLIV.
16. XV-34.
17. Anabasis, XI.
18. Philostratos in his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, pp. 44, 47, 56. Regarding the reliability of Philostratos see also R. G. Rawlinson, *Intercourse between India and the Western World*, p. 146.
19. R. C. Majumdar, *Advanced History of India*, p. 135.
20. McCrindle, *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*, p. 12; see also Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, p. 47. Let us observe that the authors of the Vaishnava poems, *Tiruppallandu* and *Kanninunci Ruttambu* employ many expressions in which slavery plays a part. These saint-poets describe themselves as the *dasas* of Vishnu, who eat the left-overs of his meal and dress themselves in his used *pitaambara* (yellow upper garment) In these poems one comes across the idea of slavery for food and of hereditary slavery.
21. Strabo, XV-1-53-6.
22. *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

Chapter VII

1. It should be noted in any case that the inclusion of the *dasas* and the *dasis* among gods does not in any way imply a non-recognition of their status as human beings. In India they have been accepted as human beings, as free men, but it was thought that

their position was due to evil actions committed in an earlier life. The point to note in this connection is the development of thought from the *Rigveda* to the Buddhist epoch. In the *Rigveda* (see Ch. II), a *dasa* can be killed, his women-folk can be taken as concubines and his goods 'appropriated' because of his being a *dasa*. Here perhaps the conquerers deny the status of a human being to the *dasa* or at least do not accord him the same status as they accord themselves. The reason is probably to be sought in the ethnic difference between the two groups. But by the 6th century B.C. or even earlier, say 1000 B.C., this difference had disappeared. All the people inhabiting the country are now taken to be *natives* of the soil. This is perhaps one of the reasons why the *dasa*, the slave of the Buddhist epoch is regarded as a human being.

2. Let it be said in passing that although for special reasons the *Tipitaka* does not make any mention of the commerce of slaves, although it does refer to their sale, prices, etc., other texts do refer to such a commerce. We have already seen (Ch. V) that the *Dharmasutras* do not allow Brahmins to live by the commerce of men even in times of distress, when they are forced to live by commerce. This clearly shows that persons belonging to other castes could carry on this trade in human beings and did so. This impression is confirmed by the *Smritis* reiterating the same view and giving other details concerning, for example, the 'conditional' purchase.

Manu, for instance, does not allow Brahmins and Kshatriyas, even in distress, to trade in human beings (*manushaah*, X-86). Yajnavalkya is of the same opinion inasmuch as he prohibits the trade in fruits, meat, cattle, perfumery, etc., as also that in human beings (*manushyaah*) to Brahmins even in times of distress (*praayas*, II, 36-8). Moreover, he prescribes a period of half-a-month (*ardha-maasikam*) for the examination of a purchased slave. This means that fifteen days after the purchase of a slave, the buyer cannot go back on his decision (*vyav.*, XIII-177). Similarly Narada also prohibits the trade in human beings to Brahmins (I, 61-2). He also prescribes a period of fifteen days for the examination of slaves of the masculine sex. In the case of woman-slaves he prolongs this period to a month (IX, 5-6). Narada also says that traders in human beings should not be allowed to appear as witnesses before courts of law (IV, 178-87). We can, therefore, say that the trade in human beings was quite well-established. See, however, K. M. Saran, *Labour in Ancient India*, p. 34: 'India can be proud of the fact that such condemnable methods of making slaves as kidnapping expeditions were not employed by Indians nor was slave-trading encouraged in this country.'

3. Here we would like to add certain remarks on the problem of impurity caused by the touch of persons thought to be untouchables. We have seen that from the *Rigveda* up to Kautalya, the

dasas are not considered untouchables. We can also see that according to these texts, the Shudras are not considered slaves. But this does not mean that there were no untouchables among them. Certain groups, such as the Chandaalas, were considered untouchables and were obliged to live outside the town or village. The question of connubiality or commensality with them did not arise. Yet this social 'boycott' did not release them from obligations imposed on them. They were obliged to take up menial jobs, like that of privy-cleaning, of lifting carcasses, etc. Obviously no one would have volunteered to take to such a profession. This obligation of carrying out dirty jobs was imposed on them by the 'touchables' who took care not to remunerate the Chandaalas properly. (It may be noted, however, that the current productive methods did not leave a big surplus and hence the inability to pay a proper wage to these strata). This is confirmed by the description of the Chandaalas as the most miserable of human beings, forced to live in whatever way, with whatever little that was given to them, adding to it a little money earned by the sale of birds, etc. From the economic point of view, their work is cheaper than that of slaves. The latter, in any case, represent some capital investment and require some minimum care. Seen from this angle, every extension of the practice of untouchability can lead to a restriction (and eventual elimination) of slavery in any domain, as in the absence of the Chandaalas (paid according to pleasure for jobs imposed on them), the slaves provide the cheapest source of man-power.

4. Westermann, *op. cit.*, p. 13. Hainchelin, *op. cit.*, p. 130.
5. This practice of keeping trade-secrets within a restricted circle is confirmed by a passage in a later text, where it is said that all the *ganas* keep their *rahassam* (secrets) within their own group (*Mlp.*, IV-IV-5).
6. If a comparison is made between the state of the material and intellectual organisations of the Aryans and the Greeks, it is found that towards the 15th century B.C., they are mostly analogous; five centuries later, those of the Aryans are more evolved. There is a strong temptation to link this progress with the existence of a high level indigenous civilisation. It is quite probable that in a large number of domains, Aryan India, despite the destruction of towns of the Indus Valley, has carried forward the same civilisation.
7. According, however, to A. Bonnard (*Civilisation Grecque*, vol. I, p. 140), the word 'pédagogue', used in the original sources did not, then, possess its modern sense. It only denoted those who accompanied their masters' boys to school and who taught them some rules of conduct.
8. There was, not far from the areas already inhabited, enough of land, which only demanded to be put under the plough (see Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 63). Let us also read here a passage from the *Milinda-panho* (IV-V-14), which informs us

that a man, 'clearing a forest-patch, and preparing land, is regarded as the owner of that piece of land.'

9. 'The needs of the Bengal peasantry are very modest and limited. A little food, some scanty clothing, a few crude utensils, a humble shelter, a few lean animals to plough with and the simplest instruments for tillage—these are what he needs' (A. Huque, *The Man Behind the Plough*, p. vi, quoted by Ramakrishna Mukerji in his *The Dynamics of a Rural Society*, p. 57).

10. This last solution was perfectly possible in a country having semi-tropical forests. Texts reveal that it was tried. If the commentary of the *Vinaya*, IV-181, tells us about the slaves, *dasakas* of the Sakiyas, who were arrested and punished for having escaped to a forest from where they had attacked the women-folk of their masters, other sources (D-a, XVI-i-4) tell us of the poor folk of the Vajjis who, disgusted by the exactions of their rulers, go and seek refuge in the forest and take revenge by attacking the territory of their masters. In the list of the various types of forests, the *jatakas* (I-99) mention a *chora-kantaara*, 'forest of thieves'. (An analysis of the word *chora* in the *Tipitaka* shows that all types of outlaws were designated by this word.) The Savaras who struck fear in a Kosalan village must have been forest-dwellers (*Vin.*, II-112). Such a possibility is confirmed, in the modern times, by the massive escape of slaves in Brazil who, not only, were able to subsist in the heart of a forest but also created a republic (Lengellé, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-4).

11. D. D. Kosambi, *Introduction* . . ., p. 10. Also Guenther and Schrot, *Problèmes théoriques*, p. 12. Later (p. 24), they say that in Aisa, slavery developed to its maximum extent in the concrete economic and historical conditions of the times. But they do not examine those conditions.

12. To judge from a reference, which although isolated, appears to refer to a widespread practice, the slaves, even when not manumitted, could mingle freely with the rest of the population and enjoy themselves on occasions such as public festivals (M-a, 39-27).

13. Kane, *op. cit.*, V./I, pp. 155-6, 184, 203, 210; Renou, *L'Inde cl.*, Vol. I, pp. 437-8.

14. See p. 54.

15. Manu, IX-179; Yajnavalkya, VIII, 13-4.

16. See, ch. VI.

17. VIII-415.

18. *Vyav.*, V, 26-8.

19. IX-229.

20. XIV-183.

21. XI-164.

22. VIII-323.

23. V-230.

24. XIV-182.

25. *Parishishtha*, verse 33, p. 226.

26. XX, 236-7.
27. XXIV, 290-1.
28. VIII, 413-4; Yajnavalkya, *vyav.*, 133.
29. For more details, see this author's 'The Shudra, the Dasa and Manu,'*Indian Journal of Social Work*, Bombay, December, 1959.

Appendix I

1. j, i-299.
2. *vin.*, i-268.
3. Bur., i-260.
4. j, vi-461.
5. j, vi-546.
6. A, vi-iv-32.
7. Bur., ii-59.
8. *Ibid.*, iii-72.
9. *Ibid.*, i-281.
10. *Ibid.*, i-220.
11. *ib.*, ii-86.
12. ii-538.
13. ii-468.
14. Dh-a, ii-144.
15. *Ibid.*, ii-193.
16. *Ibid.*, 218, 241.
17. j, ii-128, v-75.
18. j, i-86.
19. *Buddh. Ind.*, p. 14.
20. Bur., ii-41.
21. j, iv-15.
22. j, vi-366.
23. j, ii-335.
24. j, v-126.
25. j, iv-2.
26. j, v-290.
27. j, i-239, iv-323, v-127.
28. j, ii-380, iii-59, iv-248.
29. j, iv-310.
30. j, vi-179.
31. j, vi-117.
32. Dh-a, ii-9.
33. j, vi-168, 160.
34. j, iv-2.
35. j, iv-276.
36. *Dial.*, ii-221.
37. j, iv-282.
38. j, v-178.
39. M-a, 27-34.
40. Ap., 40, 35, 73, 302; ii-421.
41. *Ibid.*, 106.

42. Bv., 13.
43. Ap., ii-522.
44. Dh-a, iii-201.
45. *Ibid.*, ii-75.
46. j, iii-435.
47. j, ii-319.
48. *Ibid.*, i-178.
49. Bur., iii-84, 147.
50. Bur., i-268.
51. *Ibid.*, ii-66.
52. j, vi-404.
53. Ram., i-vi-74.
54. *Ibid.*, ii-22-31.
55. *Ibid.*, vi-44-125.
56. Mbht., ii-47, 7-8; ii-48, 10.
57. *Ibid.*, ii-45, 17-8.
58. *Ibid.*, iv-17, 17.
59. *Ibid.*, vi-22, 8.
60. *Ibid.*, iii-94, 24-5.
61. *Ibid.*, v-84, 8.
62. Ram., ii-31-47.
63. Mbht., v-155, 9.
64. j, iv-97.
65. j, vi-461.
66. j, iii-435.
67. Pv., iii-9; Ap., 55.
68. j, ii-253.
69. Bur., i-220.
70. j, ii-93.
71. j, ii-93, v-152.
72. Khudd., p. 122.
73. We may, however, observe that the similarity of methods between the Sanskrit Epics and the *Tipitaka* may, if these texts are thoroughly studied with this end in view, yield more positive results and probably reveal to us the basis of the choice of all these numbers, considered at present only as the product of a too fertile imagination.

Appendix III

1. Vin., iv-75.
2. Sv., v-18.
3. Sv, v-11.
4. D-a, v-11.
5. M-A, 110.
6. Sp-s, ii-392.
7. Vin., iv-75.

8. Dhp-a, x-11. From a reference in the *Dharma-sutras* (*Apas.*, II, 4-9-10) it may be inferred that only certain servants daily received their food (in part or whole payment of their wage) from their master's house. They are called ***nityah bhaktikah*** (those who always receive a full meal from their master). V. S. Agravala, *op. cit.*, p. 113, refers to the existence of such serving-folk, as seen in *Panini.*
9. j, i-295.
10. j, iii-446.
11. j, iv-276.
12. *Vanijakanam bhandikam vahanto*, j, iii-539.
13. j, i-236.
14. *Bhatim va kasim va katva laddha-vibhavanurupena yagu-bhatta-adini sampadetva pitaram posesi*, j, iv-43.
15. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 63.
16. *Khuddakasitanangalparikkharo*, Thg-a, 43.
17. Vin., iii-139.
18. *Ibid.*, and Sp-s, ii-48.
19. j, iii-424.
20. Dh-a, i-174.
21. Sp., p. 1069.
22. A, A-a, i-ii, p. 256.
23. Dh-a, i-204.
24. j, ii-227.
25. Thi-a, 71, *gatha*-376.
26. j, i-232.
27. Th-a, 26.
28. j, iii-446.
29. K. M. Saran, *Labour in Ancient India.*
30. j, iii-325.
31. Dh-a, i-102.
32. j, vi-337, 348.
33. j, iii-405.
34. Vin., iv-75.
35. *Dukkhena jivitam kappesi*, j, iii-424. According to the ***Maha-bhasya*** ii-185, the ***karmakaras*** accept work in the hope of earning a ***pada*** every day. Elsewhere we learn that five, six or ten could have been the wages of the ***bhrtakas*** (***pancakamsikah, satakamasikah, dasa-masikah, Ibid.***, iv-420.)
36. Dh-a, iii-87.
37. *Ibid.*
38. Vin., iv-224.
39. PED, ii-117.
40. Vin., ii-267.
41. *Tantra-varttika*, pp. 1420 and 3185.
42. Dh-A, i-230.
43. Dp-s, ii-447.
44. Thi-a, 30.
45. Vin., i-23.
46. Thi-a, 71.

47. v-312.
48. Sp-s, i-204.
49. iv-300.
50. j, ii-206.
51. j, v-211, i-291.
52. j, ii-337.
53. Thi-a, 64.
54. j, v-127.
55. Vin., i-346.
56. j, iii. 503.
57. *Bodhisattassa upatthanam agantva*, j, iii-1.
58. j, iv-431.
59. Th-a, ii-200.
60. Thi-a, 11-8; j, v-285.
61. j, ii-393.
62. Vin., iv-265.
63. Vin., ii-271.
64. infra, p. 138.
65. Dh-A, i-211.
66. j, iii-503.
67. D-A, iii-195.
68. j, v-21.
69. *Dija-kannayo,* daughters of birds; j, v-417.
70. j, iii-1.
71. Dh-a, III 79. And here is a description of the privy of the Buddha: 'That privy had a door, was full of perfumes and had garlands of flowers. Its access was for no one else and it looked like a *cetiya* (Sp., p. 745).

Appendix IV

1. *Anc. Ind. Edu.*, p. 423.
2. Filliozat and Kuno, JA., I (1938, p. 51).
3. *Itivuttaka-a,* III-III-V.
4. Vin., IV-162.
5. j, VI-135.
6. j, I-225.
7. Vin., I-343.
8. 23-9.
9. D-a, XIV-I-34.
10. D-a, XIV-I-34.
11. Bur., III-232.
12. Vin., I-237.
13. Sp-s, I-55 and 91.
14. Dh-a, II-86.
15. j, III-413. The term, *pada paricarika* (j, I-204), however, should not be translated literally to denote 'woman servant of the feet' and hence woman servant'. It signifies 'wife'. Elsewhere we come across '*paddha-cara*' as a synonym of this word (j, VI-268).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PALI CANON AND COMMENTARIES

Vinaya Pitaka, ed. by H. Oldenberg. vols. I-IV. London, 1880-02. (Eng. trans. by Miss. I. B. Horner. vols. I-IV. London, 1938-52).

Samanta Pasadika, ed. by Takakusu and Nagai. vols. I-VI. London, 1925-47. (Edn. in Siamese script. vols. I-II. Bangkok, 1918).

Digha Nikaya, ed. by T. W. Rhys Davids & J. Carpentier. vols. I-II. London, 1889-1911. (Eng. trans. by T. W. Rhys Davis. vols. I-III. London, 1889-1921).

Sumangala-Vilasini, ed. by T. W. Rhys Davids and J. Carpentier (vol. I) and W. Stede (vol. II). London, 1886-1931.

Majjhima Nikaya, ed. by V. Trenckner (vol. I) and Lord Chalmers (vols, II-III). London, 1888-1902. (Eng. trans. by Lord Chalmers. vols. I-II. London, 1926-27; Fr. trans. by Louis Renou. vol. I. fas. I. Paris, 1949).

Papanca-Sudani, ed. by J. H. Wood and D. D. Kosambi. vols. I-II. London, 1922-28.

Samyutta Nikaya, ed. by M. L. Feer. vols. I-IV. London, 1884-94. [Eng. trans. by Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids (vols. I-II) and F. L. Woodward (vols. III-IV). London, 1917-1929].

Sarattha Pakasini, ed. by F. L. Woodward. vols. I-II. London, 1929. (Edn. in Siamese script. Bangkok, 1919).

Aniguttara Nikaya, ed. by R. Morris (vols. I-II) and E. Hardy (vols. III-IV). London, 1885-1900. [Eng. trans. by Woodward (vols. I, II, V) and E. M. Hare (vols. III-IV). London, 1932-35].

Manoratha-Purani. Edn. in Siamese script. Bangkok.

Khuddaka-Patha, with the comm. Paramatthajotika, ed. by H. Smith. vol. I. London, 1915.

Dhammapada Atthakatha, ed. by H. C. Norman. vols. I-IV. London, 1906-14 (Eng. trans. by E. W. Burlingame. vols. I-III. Cambridge, Mass., 1921.)

Udana, ed. by P. Steinthal. London, 1885. (Eng. trans. by F. L. Woodward. London, 1935).

Paramattha-Dipani on the above, ed. by F. L. Woodward. London, 1926.

Itivuttaka, ed. by E. Windisch. London, 1935.

Paramattha-Dipani on the above, ed. by M. M. Bose. vol. I. London, 1934. (Edn. in Siamese script. Bangkok, 1919).

Sutta Nipata, ed. by D. Andersen and H. Smith. London, 1934. (Eng. trans. by M. Coomaraswami. London, 1874).

Paramattha-Jotika, ed. H. Smith. vols. I-III. London, 1916-18.

Vimana-Vatthu, ed. by E. R. Goonaratne. London, 1886.

Paramattha-Dipani on the above. ed. by E. Hardy. London, 1901.

Peta-Vatthu, ed. by Minayeff. London, 1889.

Paramattha-Dipani on the above, ed. by E. Hardy. London, 1894.
Thera-Gatha, ed. by H. Oldenberg. London, 1883. (Eng. trans. by Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids. London, 1913) .
Paramattha-Dipani on the above, ed. by F. L. Woodward. vols. I-II. London, 1940-52.
Theri-Gatha, ed. H. Oldenberg and Pischel. London, 1883 (Eng. trans. by Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids. London, 1909).
Paramattha-Dipani on the above, ed. by F. Muller. London, 1893
Jataka-Attha-Vannana, ed. by V. Fausboll. vols. I-VI. London, 1877-96. (Eng. trans. by several scholars, vol. VI. Cambridge, 1913).
Niddesa (Culla), ed. by W. Stede. London, 1918.
Niddesa (Maha), ed. by L. V. Poussin and E. J. Thomas. London, 1916-17.
Saddhamma-Pajjotika, ed. by A. P. Buddhadatta. vol. I. London. 1931.
Apadana, ed. by Mary E. Lilley. vols. I-II. London, 1925-7.
Visuddha-Jana-Vilasini, ed. by C. E. Godakumbura. London, 1954.
Buddha-Vamsa, ed. by R. Morris. London, 1882.
Madhurattha-Vilasini, by Buddhadatta Mahathera. ed. by Miss. I. B. Horner. London, 1946.
Cariya-Pitaka, ed. by R. Morris. London, 1882.
Paramattha-Dipani on the above, ed. by D. L. Barua. London, 1939.

NON-CANONICAL

Milinda-Panho, ed. by R. D. Vadekar. Bombay, 1940. (Fr. trans. by L. Finot. Paris, 1923; Hindi trans, by Jagadish Kashyapa. Calcutta, 1951.

B. SANSKRIT TEXTS

Aitareya Brahmana
Apastamba-Dharma-Sutra. ed. by G. Bühler. Bombay, 1868 (Eng. trans. by G. Bühler. Oxford, 1879). *Ujjvala*, comm. of Haradatta Mishra on the above. Banaras, 1932.
Artha-Shastra, ed. by J. Jolly. vol. I. Lahore, 1923; ed. by T. G. Shastri. vols. I-III. Trivandrum. (Eng. trans. by R. Shamashastry. Bangalore, 1951).
Atharva-Veda.
Baudhayana-Dharma-Sutra, ed. by E. Hultzch. Leipzig, 1884. (Eng. trans. by G. Bühler. Oxford, 1882).
Brhadaranyaka-Upanisad.
Brhspati Smrti. Reconstituted by K. V. R. Aiyangar. Baroda, 1941.
Caraka-Samhita.
Chandogya-Upanisad.
Gautama Dharma-Sastra, ed. by A. F. Stenzler. London, 1876. With the comm. of Maskarin, ed. by L. Srinivasacharya. Mysore, 1917. (Eng. trans. by G. Bühler. Oxford, 1879).
Kama-Sutra.
Kathaka Grhya-Sutra. With the summary of three comms. ed. by W. Caland. Lahore, 1925.

Katha-Upanisad.
Kausitaki-Brahmana-Upanisad.
Kausitaka-Grhya-Sutra. With the comm. of Bhavatrata. ed. by T. R. Chintamani. Madras, 1944.
Khadira-Grhya-Sutra. With the comm. of Rudraskanda. Madras, 1913.
Mahabharata, ed. by P. C. Roy. Calcutta, 1877; ed. by Sukthankar. Poona.
Mahabhasya. Nirnaya--Sagara Press edn. Bombay, 1935-51.
Manu-Smriti, ed. by Jivananda Vidyasagara. Calcutta, 1874 (Fr. trans. by G. Strehly. Paris, 1893: Eng. trans. with comms. by J. N. Jha. Allahabad).
Markandeyapurana. Calcutta, 1862.
Narada-Smrti, ed. by J. Jolly. Calcutta, 1885.
Nirukta, ed. by Rajvade. Poona, 1940. With the comm. of Durga, ed. by Rajvade. Poona, 1921; with the comm. of Skanda-Mahesvara, ed. by L. Sarup. vols. I-III. Lahore, 1928-34.
— ed. by H. Sköld. Lund, 1926 (Eng. trans. by L. Sarup. vols. I-II. Oxford, 1920-1).
Panini (Grammaire de). Fr. trans. by L. Renou. vols. I-III. Paris, 1948-54.
Paraskara-Grhya-Sutra, with the comm. of Harihara (Eng. trans. by H. Oldenberg. Oxford).
Ramayana (of Valmiki), with the comm. *Tilaka.* vols. I-II. Bombay, 1888. With three comms. vols. I-VII. Gujarati Press, Bombay, 1920.
— ed. by G. Gorresio. Paris, 1843.
Rg-Veda.
Sankhayana-Grhya-Sutra.
Susruta-Samhita.
Tantra-Varttika of Kumarila. Poona, 1910.
Vasistha-Dharma-Sastra, ed. by A. A. Führer. Poona, 1930 (Eng. trans. by G. Bühler. Oxford, 1882).
Yajnavalkya-Smriti, with the comm., *Mitaksara.* Bombay, 1887.

MISCELLANEOUS

Abhidhana-Cintamani of Hemacandra
Abhidhana-Rajendra-Kosa, vols. I-IV. Ratlam, 1913-25.
Dharma-Kosa. Wai (Satara Dt.). vols. I-II. 1937-50.
Jataka-Stava. Khotanese text. ed. with a trans. in Eng. by J. Dresden. Philadelphia, 1955.
Kanninuncirutambu.
Nama-Linga-Anusasana of Amarasimha.
Nana-Artha-Arnava-Samksepa.
Sabda-Artha-Cintamani.
Sabdakalpadruma.
Smrti-Candrika.
Tiruppallandu.
Vacaspatya.

C. MODERN WORKS

ADAM, W. *Law and Custom of Slavery in British India*. London.
AGRAWALA, R. C. *'The Position of the Slaves and Serfs as Depicted in Kharosthi Inscriptions.'* IHQ, vol. 29/2.
—— 'Buddhist Monks in Chinese Turkestan.' *Sarup Bharati*. Hoshiarpur.
——'Gifts and Presents in Kharosthi Documents.' Bhar. Vid., vol. XVIII, pts. 3-4. Bombay.
——'Religious Conditions as Depicted in the Niya Documents.' JGIS, vol. XIV, pt. I. Calcutta.
ARSIKHOVSKI, A. V. 'Sociological Significance of the Evolution of Agricultural Implements.' *Trudii Sotsiologicheskoi Sektsi Ranion*, vol. I. Moscow, 1927.
AVDIEV, V. I. *Istoria Drevnego, Vostoka* ('History of the Ancient East'). Moscow, 1953.
BANAJI, D. R. *Slavery in British India*, 1772-1843. Bombay, 1933.
BANERJI, N. C. *Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India*. Calcutta, 1925.
——'Slavery in Ancient India'. CR, August, 1930.
BARROW, R. H. *Slavery in the Roman Empire*. London, 1928.
BASHAM, A. L. *The History and Doctrines of the Ajivikas*. London, 1951.
——*The Wonder That was India*. London, 1954.
BASU, S. N. 'Slavery in the Jatakas.' JBORS, vol. IX. Patna.
BHATTACHARYA, K. 'Temple Administration in Khmer Kingdom.' CR, Feb. 1955.
BIOT *'Sur la condition des esclaves et des serviteurs gagés en chine'*. JA, March, 1837. Paris.
BLOCH, J. *Les inscriptions d'Asoka*. Paris, 1950.
BLOCH, M. *'Comment et pourquoi finit l'esclavage antique.'* Annals. Paris, 1947.
BONNARD, A. *Civilisation Grecque*, vols. I-II (Lausanne).
BOSE, A. N. *Social and Rural Economy of N.-E. India, 600* B.C.-A.D. 200. Calcutta, 1945.
BUCH, M. A. *Economic Life in Ancient India*. Bombay, 1924.
BUCHANAN, F. H. *An Account of the District of Purnea*, 1809-10. Patna, 1928.
——*An Account of the District of Bhagalpur*, 1809-11. Patna, 1939.
——*An Account of the District of Bihar and Patna*, 1811-12. Patna.
——*Journey Through Mysore, Canara, Coorg and Malabar.*
——*Nepal*. Edinburg, 1819.
BU-STON. *History of Buddhism* (Eng. trans. by E. Obermiller. Heidelberg, 1932).
CARCOPINO, J. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*. H'worth, 1956.
CHAKLADAR, H. C. *Social Life in Ancient India*. Calcutta, 1929.
CHANANA, D. R. 'Notes on Some Ancient Indian Words.' JOI, vol. VII, pt. 4. Baroda.
——'The Ideological Aspect of Slavery in Ancient India.' JOI, vol. VIII, pt. 4. Baroda.

——'The Position of the Buddha in the Conflict Between the Vajjis and Magadha.' JBRS, Buddha Jayanti, no. II. Patna.
——'Studies on the Problem of Slavery.' IJSW, Dec. 1958. Bombay.
——'The Shudra, the Dasa and Manu.' IJSW, Dec. 1959. Bombay.
CHAPEKAR, N. G. 'Dasas and Dasyus.' JAS, vol. 30, pt. II. Bombay.
CHILDE, V. G. *New Light on the Most Ancient East*. London, 1952.
——*The Pre-History of European Society*. H'worth, 1958.
——*What Happened in History?* H'worth, 1946.
COLEBROOKE, H. T. *Remarks on the Husbandry and Internal Commerce of Bengal*. London, 1806.
——*A Digest of Hindu Law on Contract and Successions*. Calcutta, 1797-98.
DAS, S. K. *The Economic History of Ancient India*. Calcutta, 1944.
DANGE, S. A. *India from Primitive Communism to Slavery*. Bombay, 1949.
DIES, A. and GERNET, L. '*Platon, Ceuvres Completes*,' vol. XI, pt. I. Paris, 1951.
DIKSHITAR, V. R. R. *War in Ancient India*. Madras, 1944.
DIWAKAR, R. R. *Bihar Through the Ages*. Calcutta, 1958.
DONINI, A. 'The Myth of Salvation and Ancient Slave Society'. SS, vol. XV, pt. I. New York.
——*Lineanmenti di storia delle religioni* (Outline of the History of Religions). Rome, 1959.
DUBOIS, L'ABBE. *Moeurs, institutions et cérémomes des peuples de l'Inde*. Paris, 1825.
DUTT, B. N. *Studies in Indian Social Polity*. Calcutta, 1944.
DUTT, N. N. *Early Monastic Buddhism*, vols. I-II. Calcutta, 1941-45.
ELWAHED, A. A. *Contribution a une théorie sociologique de l'esclavage*. Paris, 1931.
ENGELS, F. *Anti-Duhring* (Fr. edn.). Paris, 1950.
——*L' Origine de la famille, de la propriété privé et de l' état*. Paris, 1954. Eng. edn. Moscow, 1949.
FARRINGTON, B. *Head and Hand In Ancient Greece*. London, 1947.
——*Greek Science*. vols. I-II. H'worth, 1944-49.
——*Science and Politics in the Ancient World*. London, 1946.
FICK, R. *The Social Organisation in N.-E. India*. Calcutta, 1920.
FILLIOZAT, J. (with KUNO). '*Fragment du Vinaya des Sarvastivadin*.' JA, Jan.-March, 1938. Paris.
FILLIOZAT, J. (with RENOU): *L'Inde classique*. vols. I-II. Paris, 1947-53.
FILLIOZAT, J. *Relations exterieures de l'Inde*. Pondichery, 1957.
FISER, I. 'The Problem of the Setthi in Buddhist Jatakas.' Ar. Or., vol. XXII. Prague.
FOUCART, P. '*Mémoire sur l'affranchissement des esclaves par forme de vente à une divinité*.' *Archievs des missions scientifiques et littéraires*, no. III. 1867. Paris.
FOUCHER, A. *La vieille route de l'Inde*. vol. II. Paris, 1947.
FRANKFORT, H. *The Birth of Civilisation in the Far East*. London, 1951.
FRIS, O. '*Otrokarsky rad ve stare Indii* (The Slave System in

Ancient India). *Novy Orient.* no. VIII, 1953. Prague.
——*'Structure staroindicke spolecnosti'* (The Structure of the Ancient Indian Society). Prague, 1953.
GERNET, J. *Aspects économiques du Boudhisme en Chine.* Paris, 1956.
GHIRSHMAN, R. *Iran.* H'worth, 1954.
GHOSHAL, U. N. *The Beginnings of Indian Historiography and Other Essays.* Calcutta, 1944.
GHURYE, G. S. *Caste and Class in India.* Bombay, 1950.
GLOTZ, G. *Le travail dans la Grèce ancienne.* Paris, 1920.
GOKHALE. B. G. *Buddhism and Ashoka.* Bombay, 1948.
GURNEY, O. B. *The Hittites.* H'worth, 1952.
HAINCHELIN, CH. *Les origines de la religion.* Paris, 1940.
HALHEAL *A Code of Gentoo Laws.* London, 1776.
HAUDRICOURT, A. (with DELAMARRE, J. B.). *L'homme et la charrue.* Paris, 1955.
HAUDRICOURT, A. (with HEDIN). *L'homme et les plantes cultivés.* Paris, 1943.
HEESTERMAN, J. C. *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration.* The Hague, 1957.
HEITLAND, W. E. *Agricola. A Study of Agrictural Life in the Graeco-Roman World* (from the point of labour). Mnemosyne, 1933.
HUTTON, J. C. *Les castes de l'Inde.* Paris, 1949.
HROZNY, B. *Ancient History of West Asia, India and Crete.* Prague 1951.
ILIN, G. F. *'Sudras und Sklaven in den altindischen gesetzbuchern.' Sowjtwissenschaft.* Berlin, 1952.
——*'Osobennosti rabstva o dreveni indii'.* VDI, Moscow, 1951.
IRWIN, J. *'Class-Struggle in Ancient India,'* MQ. London, 1946.
JAIN, J. C. *Life in Ancient India* (As Depicted in the Jaina Canons). Bombay, 1939.
JAMESON, R. P. *Montesquieu et l'esclavage.* Paris, 1911.
JAYASWAL, K. P. *Hindu Polity.* Bangalore, 1943.
JENNINGS, J. G. *The Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha.* Oxford, 1949.
KANE, P. V. *The History of the Dharmasastra.* vols. I-V. Poona, 1932-57.
KAUTSKY, K. *Slave Society in Imperial Rome.* Sydney.
KAZAMANOVA. *'L'esclavage en crète aux* VIe-IVe *s.av.n.e.* VDI. Moscow, 1952.
KEITH, A. B. *The History of Sanskrit Literature.* London, 1953.
KONOW, S. *Kautalya Studies.* Oslo, 1945.
KORSOUNSKY, A. R. *'La situation des esclaves, des affranchis, des colons dans les provinces occidentales de l'empire romain aux* IV-ve s. VDI, 1954, pt. 2.
KOSAMBI, D. D. *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History.* Bombay, 1956.
——'On a Marxist Approach to History,' ABORI. Poona, 1951.
——'What Constitutes Indian History.' ABORI. Poona, 1954.
——'The Basis of Ancient Indian History.' JAOS. Baltimore, 1955.
LANDE, F. N. *Discours de rentrée.* Pondicherry, 1872.

LANDTMAN, G. *The Origin of the Inequality of the Social Classes.* London, 1938.
LAW, B. C. *A History of Pali Literature.* London, 1933.
—— *India as Described in the Early Texts of Jainism and Buddhism.* London, 1941.
—— *Historical Geography of Ancient India.* Paris, 1954.
LEFEBVRE DESNOETTES. *De la marine antique a la marine moderne.* Paris, 1935.
—— *L' attellage, le cheval de selle a travers les ages.* Paris, 1931.
LENGELLE, M. *L' esclavage.* Paris, 1955.
LENTZMANN, Y. A. *'Termini oboznachayushchiye rabov v drevenegrecheskom yazike'* (Terms Denoting Slaves in Ancient Greek). VDI, pt. 2. Moscow, 1951.
LETOURNEAU, CH. *L'évolution de l'esclavage dans les diverses races humaines.* Paris, 1897.
LEVASSEUR, CH. *De l'influence de l'art mecanique sur l'abolition de l'esclavage antique.* Rouen, 1884.
LEVI, S. *Népal. vols. I-II.* Paris, 1905.
LEVY, P. *'Discours d'ouverture.' La Pensée,* No. 66. Paris, 1956.
LINGAT, R. *L'esclavage privé dans le vieux droit siamois.* Paris, 1931
——*Le Vinaya et le droit laïque.* Paris, 1937.
LOUIS, P. *Le travail dans le monde romain.* Paris, 1937.
LUDERS, H. 'A List of Brahmi Inscriptions'. *Epigraphia Indica,* vol. X. Calcutta, 1912.
LYASHCHENKO, P. I. *History of the National Economy of Russia.* New York, 1949.
MCCRINDLE, J. W. *Indica of Arrian.* Bombay, 1876.
—— *Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian.* London, 1877.
—— *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea.* Calcutta, 1877.
—— *Ancient India as Described by Ktesias.* Bombay, 1882.
—— *The Invasion of India by Alexander.* London, 1893.
MACDONELL, A. A. (with KEITH, A. B.) *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects.* vols. I-II. London, 1912.
MACKAY, E. & D. *Early Indus Civilisation.* London, 1848.
MAJUMDAR, D. N. *Races and Cultures of India.* Bombay, 1858.
MAJUMDAR, R. C. and PUSALKAR, A. D. (Ed.) *The Vedic Age.* London.
—— *The Age of Imperial Unity,* Bombay, 1951.
MAJUMDAR, R. C. (with others). *An Advanced History of India.* London, 1949.
MALALASEKHARA, G. P. *A Pali Dictionary of Proper Names and Subjects.* vols. I-II. London.
MARSHALL, J. *Mohenjo-Daro.* vols. I-III. London, 1931.
—— *Taxila.* Cambridge, 1951.
MARTIN, M. *The History, Antiquities, Topography and Statistics of Eastern India.* vols. I-III. London, 1838.
MEHTA, R. L. *Pre-Buddhist India.* Bombay, 1939.
MENDELSOHN, I. *Slavery in the Ancient Near East.* New York, 1949.
MITRA, R. C. *Le déclin du Bouddhism* (Thesis at the Sorbonne). 1949.

MOEHLER, J. H. *De l'abolition de l'esclavage*. Paris, 1841.
MONAHAN. *Early History of Bengal*. Oxford, 1925.
MONDOLFO, R. 'Greek Attitude to Manual Labour.' PP, no. 6.
MONTESQUIEU. *De l'esprit des lois*. Paris, 1869.
MOOKERJI, R. K. *Ancient Indian Education*. London, 1951.
MORELAND. *India at the Death of Akbar*. London, 1920.
MORET, A. *Le travail dans l'Orient ancien*. Paris.
MORGAN, L. H. *Ancient Society*. Calcutta.
MORROW, G. R. *Plato's Law of Slavery*. Illinois, 1939.
MORRIS, J. 'Slaves and Serfs.' MQ. London, 1948.
MOSSE, C. *'La Formation de l'etat esclavagiste en Grèce.' La Pensée*, no. 66. Paris, 1956.
NARSU, P. L. *The Essence of Buddhism*. Madras, 1912.
NIEBOER, H. J. *Slavery as an Industrial System*. The Hague, 1900.
OLDENBERG, H. *Le Buddha*. Paris, 1934.
PANDE, G. C. *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*. Allahabad, 1957.
PANIKKAR, K. M. *Geographical Factors in Indian History*. Bombay, 1955.
PARAIN, CH. *'De la société antique á la société feodale.' La Pensée*. no. 66. Paris, 1956.
——*Etats et classes dans l'antiquite esclavagiste: structure, évolution*. Paris, 1957.
PEGGS, J. *East Indian Slavery*. London.
PHILOSTRATOS. *The Indian Travels of Apollonios of Tyana*. London, 1873.
PIGGOTT, S. *Pre-Historic India*. H'worth, 1950.
PINKHAM, M. W. *Woman in the Sacred Scriptures of Hinduism*. New York, 1941.
PRAN NATH. *Economic History of India*. London, 1929.
PREMI, N. R. *Jain Sahitya aur Itihasa*. Bombay, 1956.
PRIVAULUX, O. B. (ed.) *The Indian Embassies to Rome*. London, 1873.
POUSSIN, LOUIS DE LA VALLEE. *L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas*. Paris, 1930.
——*Dynasties et histoire de l'Inde*. Paris, 1935.
RAHULA, W. *The History of Buddhism in Ceylon*. Colombo, 1956.
RAMGOPAL *India of the Vedic Kalpasutras*. Delhi, 1959.
RAPSON, E. J. (ed.). *Cambridge History of India*. vol. I. Cambride, 1922.
RAWLINSON, H. G. *Intercourse Between India and the Western* World, Cambridge, 1916.
RAYNAL, L'ABBE *L'histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des européens dans les deux Indes*. Avignon, 1788.
RENOU, L. *La civilisation indienne*. Paris, 1950.
——*La grammaire de Panini*. vols. I-III. Paris, 1948-54.
RENOU, L. (with FILLIOZAT, J.). *L'Inde classique*. vols. I-II. Paris, 1947-53.
RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. *Buddhist India*. Calcutta, 1950.

RHYS DAVIDS, C. A. F. 'Notes on Early Economic Conditions in N. India.' JRAS. London, 1901.
—— 'Economic Conditions in Ancient India.' *Economic Journal.* London, 1901.
ROCKHILL, W. *The Life of the Buddha.* London, 1884.
ROSTOVTZEFF, M. *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire.* Oxford, 1926.
RUBEN, W. *Die lage der sklaven in der altindischen gesselschaft.* Berlin, 1957.
RUFUS, Q. C. *The History of the Life and Reign of Alexander.* London, 1890.
SAMADDAR, J. *Economic Conditions of Ancient India.* Calcutta, 1922.
SANKRITYAYANA, R. *Buddha-Charya.* Banaras, 1946.
SARAN, K. M. *Labour in Ancient India.* Bombay, 1957.
SARUP, L. 'Some Aspects of Slavery.' JPHS, vol. VIII. Lahore.
SCHLAIFER, R. *Greek Theories of Slavery from Homer to Aristotle.* Harvard, 1936.
SENART, E. *Les castes dans l'Inde.* Paris, 1927.
SERENI, E. *Communita rurali nell 'Italia antica.* Rome, 1955.
SERGUEENKO, M. E. '*Sur l'économie rurale de l'Italie antique.*' VDI 1953, pt. 3.
SHARMA, R. S. *Sudras in Ancient India.* Delhi, 1958.
SHASTRI, K. N. *The Age of the Nandas and the Mauryas.* Banaras, 1952.
SHASTRI, SHAKUNTALA R. *Women in the Vedic Age.* Bombay, 1954.
—— *Women in the Sacred Laws.* Bombay, 1953.
SIEGEL, B. J. 'Some Methodological Considerations on a Comparative Study of Slavery.' AA, 1945.
——'Slavery During the Third Dynasty of Ur'. AA, 1949.
SIMON, LADY. *L'esclavage.* Paris, 1930.
SOMERVELL, D. C. *A Short History of Our Religion.* London, 1925.
STEIN, O. *Megasthenes und Kautalya.* Vienna, 1921.
STEINER, F. B. *A Comparative Study of the Forms of Slavery* (Thesis at Oxford).
TARANATH, LAMA. *A History of Buddhism* (in Tibetan). trans. in German by Schiefner. Leningrad, 1869.
THEROU, L'ABBE. *Le christianisme et l'esclavage.* Paris, 1841.
THOMPSON, G. *Aeschylus & Athens.* London, 1946.
——*Studies in Ancient Greek Society—The Prehistoric Alageans.* London, 1955.
——*Studies in Ancient Greek Society—The First Philosophers.* London, 1955.
TOURMAGNE. *Histoire de l'esclavage.* Paris, 1880.
TOYNBEE, A. *A Study of History.* vols. III-IV. London, 1934.
UPADHYAYA, B. S. *Women in the Rigveda.* Banaras, 1941.
WALLON, H. *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité.* Paris, 1879.
WESTERMANN, W. L. *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity.* Philadelphia, 1955.
WESTERMARCK. *L'origine et le dévelopment des idées morales.* vols. I-II. Paris, 1928-29.

WHEELER, R. M. *The Indus Civilisation.* Cambridge, 1953.
WILBUR, C. M. *Slavery in China During the Former Han Dynasty.* Chicago, 1943.
WINTERNITZ, M. *A History of Indian Literature.* vols. I-II, Calcutta 1933.
WHITFHEAD, A. M. *Adventures of Ideas.* New York, 1955.

D. DICTIONARIES AND ENCYCLOPAEDIAE

BALFOUR. *Cyclopaedia of India and of Eastern and Southern Asia.* London, 1885.
BOHTLINGK and ROTH. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch.*
EDGERTON, F. *Buddhist Hybrid Sankrit Dictionary.* New Haven.
Encyclopaedia Britannica.
Encyclopédie française.
La grande encyclopédie.
Enclyclopédie nouvelle.
GRASSMAN. *Wörterbuch zum Rigveda.* Leipzig.
Hastings Encyclopaedia.
MONIER WILLIAMS, M. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary.* Oxford.
RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. *Pali-English Dictionary.* London.
TRENCKNER, V. *A Critical Pali Dictionary.* Copenhagen.
TURNER, R. *A Comparative and Etymological Dictionary of the Nepali Language.* London.
VISHVABANDHU. *A Vedic Word Concordance.* Hoshiarpur.

E. JOURNALS

AA	*American Anthropologist.* Philadelphia.
ABORI	*Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.* Poona.
Annales	*Annales, économies, sociétés, civilisations.* Paris.
Anc. Ind.	*Ancient India.* Deptt. of Archaeology. New Delhi.
Ar. Or	*Archiv Orientalni.* Prague.
Bhar. Vid.	*Bharatiya Vidya.* Bombay.
BEFEO	*Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrème Orient.* Saigon-Paris.
CR	*Calcutta Review.* Calcutta.
Dh. Dt.	*Dharma Duta.* Banaras.
Ep. Ind.	*Epigraphia Indica.* Ootacamund.
IHQ	*Indian Historical Quarterly.* Calcutta.
IJSW	*Indian Journal of Social Work.* Bombay.
JA	*Journal asiatique.* Paris.
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society.* Baltimore.
JBORS	*Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.* Patna.
JBRS	*Journal of the Bihar Research Society.* Patna.

JGIS	*Journal of the Greater India Society*. Calcutta.
JIH	*Journal of Indian History*. Trivandrum.
JOI	*Journal of the Oriental Institute*. Baroda.
JPHS	*Journal of the Panjab Historical Society*. Lahore.
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. London.
MQ	*Modern Quarterly*. London.
Pen	*La Pensée*. Paris.
PP	*Past and Present*. Kendal, England.
SS	*Science and Society*. New York.
VDI	*Vestnik Drevnei Istorii*. Moscow.

INDEX OF TERMS RELATING TO SLAVERY

GENERAL INDEX